ISSUED QUARTERLY 50 CENTS

The Forum

EDITED BY J. M. RICE

JANUARY—MARCH, 1907

AMERICAN POLITICS . . . . . Henry Litchfield West 291

FOREIGN AFFAIRS . . . . . A. Maurice Low 304

FINANCE . . . . . Alexander D. Noyes 323

APPLIED SCIENCE . . . . . Henry Harrison Suplee 345

EDUCATIONAL OUTLOOK . . . . . Ossian H. Lang 359

LITERATURE:

A FEW BOOKS ON SHAKESPEARE . Prof. W. P. Trent 371

SOME RECENT GUIDES TO CULTURE Prof. William T. Brewster 381

THE DRAMA . . . . . Henry Tyrrell 394

INEXPENSIVE RECIPROCITY . . Prof. John Bates Clark 413

THE REHABILITATION OF CHINA AND THE AMERICAN INTEREST IN THE ORIENT . Mohammad Barakatullah 424

NEW YORK

THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY

45 East Forty-second Street

Paris Agency: Librairie Galignani, 224 [illegible] Rivoli

50 Cts. a Copy [Vol. XXXVIII, No. 3] $2.[illegible]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BEST THINGS

In English Periodical Literature Reprinted Unabridged In a Single Weekly Magazine at Moderate Cost

Indispensable to every reader who wishes to keep informed upon public affairs and current discussion

The subscription price is SIX DOLLARS a year, postpaid in the United States, Canada, and Mexico. To introduce the magazine, TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS will be received, Three Months (thirteen numbers) for ONE DOLLAR.

WHATEVER other magazines you may subscribe for, you cannot afford not to see regularly The Living Age (Littell's).

It supplements the American magazines, containing what they do not.

It makes superfluous the taking of a considerable list of English magazines, as it reproduces without abridgment the freshest, most important, and most timely articles from their pages.

More than thirty of the leading English periodicals are regularly drawn upon to make the contents of The Living Age.

The magazine publishes the best essays, fiction, poetry, travel sketches, literary, art, and musical criticism, historical and biographical papers, scientific articles, discussions of social, religious, and educational questions, and papers upon PUBLIC AFFAIRS and INTERNATIONAL POLITICS, together with an editorial department devoted to "Books and Authors."

No other magazine, American or English, presents the writings of so many brilliant and distinguished authors.

Light and easy to hold, the magazine contains each year about twice as much material as any of the four-dollar magazines, and its weekly issue enables it to present the articles which it reproduces with great promptness.

THE LIVING AGE CO.

BEACON STREET BOSTON, MASS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FORUM.

VOL. XXXVIII. NO. 3.

JANUARY—MARCH, 1907.

NEW YORK:

THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COPYRIGHT, 1907,
BY THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

PRESS OF
THE PUBLISHERS' PRINTING COMPANY
419, 421 LAFAYETTE STREET,
NEW YORK

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Forum

JANUARY, 1907.

AMERICAN POLITICS.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S message to Congress, presented at the opening of the session, is not only the latest deliverance in matters political, but is also the most imporant. It places the President far ahead of his party. Whether the latter will move up to the advanced place which the President occupies is another question. At any rate, he has blazed the way, to speak in the vernacular of the West, and, confident in the logic of his position, will calmly await developments.

It is, indeed, a remarkable thing to see the head of the Republican party, for instance, demanding the enactment of a law imposing a graduated income tax. For many years this has been a distinctly Democratic proposition. The last income-tax law upon the statute books was enacted in 1894, when the Democrats controlled both branches of the National Legislature, and during the incumbency of President Cleveland. This law was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States; but, as President Roosevelt points out, the decision was reached by the narrow majority of one, and he thinks that this fact ought to be taken into consideration. He admits that it will be difficult to draft a law which shall be held to be constitutional, but he will not concede that it is absolutely impossible.

Without regard to this phase of the question, however, the interesting fact is that President Roosevelt takes the stand that "the man of great wealth owes a peculiar obligation to the state, because he derives special advantages from the mere existence of government." The weight and influence of the President will go far toward making this idea a popular one; and it is not unlikely that he will create such a follow-

Permission to republish articles is reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing for the proposition as to secure the incorporation of an income-tax plank in the next national Republican platform. If he can do this, he will have achieved a great victory; for certainly the advocacy of an income tax has never yet been regarded as a tenet of the Republican faith.

The President goes further. He recommends a law prohibiting all corporations from contributing to the campaigns of any party. This is another long step forward, and it is thoroughly in line with the trend of modern opinion. The corporations would, of course, be glad to experience relief from the appeals of the campaign collector; but the public would also be benefited by the enactment of such a law, inasmuch as the party in power, having been freed from obligation to the corporations, would be enabled to enact hostile legislation without a qualm of conscience.

If such a law as the President suggests could be passed, the result would certainly be purer elections. Under the present system, a very large percentage of the money used in political campaigns comes from the corporations. In many instances these corporations contribute impartially to both parties, naturally desiring to be *en rapport* with the organization successful at the polls. They are certain to be on the winning side, no matter which party wins. If these contributions of the corporations are eliminated, the campaign committees will not have as much money to expend. There will be fewer special trains carrying partisan orators; there will be less literature disseminated; there will be little or no money for use on election day.

Suppose, however, that all these things should result? Does any one contend that the country would be injured thereby? On the contrary, the people would have an opportunity to act more generally upon their own volition. The daily newspapers supply enough political pabulum, and, with all temptation to pervert the news removed, will discuss impartially and fairly the questions at issue. In periods of ordinary political activity, when there is nothing more at stake than the possession of the offices, the people will act without being unduly influenced. If, on the other hand, it should become necessary to check a dangerous popular movement, there would be no trouble in raising all the funds that might be needed to arouse the great mass of the voters to a realization of the impending crisis. In other words, the money necessary to meet the legitimate expenses of a campaign will always be forthcoming; and the country will agree with the President that it ought not to come out of the treasuries of corporations that are benefited by legislative enactment.

No one ought to object, either, to the proposition to compel pub-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

licity in the matter of campaign contributions and expenses. The New York law has operated to the benefit of the people. The public ought to be informed as to the amounts which are received and spent by the respective candidates for their suffrages; and, in fact, all the items ought to be presented in detailed form. If the expenditure is right, no harm can result from submitting it to the broadest scrutiny; if it is wrong, there is all the more reason why it should receive general condemnation. It will be interesting to observe whether Congress will enact into law the measures now before it seeking to enforce this wise publicity.

From indications at the present writing, the session of Congress will be mainly confined to the enactment of the appropriation bills. These budgets are growing larger and larger with each succeeding year; but inasmuch as the revenues are keeping pace with the expenditures, no burden falls upon the country. There is no widespread criticism of Federal appropriations, there being a very general realization of the fact that the nation is like a large business corporation, requiring a larger outlay as it expands. The fact is, too, that during the past few years the estimates submitted by the various departments of the Government have been carefully revised, and the number of questionable items in the budgets have been reduced to a minimum.

An effort will be made in the House to enact the so-called ship-subsidy bill, which has already passed the Senate. Speaker Cannon is quoted as being in opposition to this measure; and his antagonism, while not necessarily fatal, certainly places the bill in a doubtful position. Much has been said for and against this measure, its advocates insisting that its enactment will restore the prestige of the American merchant marine, while its opponents claim that there is no more reason for subsidizing ship-owners than farmers or other producers. If the measure is reported to the House, a lengthy debate is certain to result. In the Senate, awaiting consideration, is the bill which passed the House during the last session, after much excitement, reducing the tariffs on Philippine sugar, tobacco, and rice to twenty-five per cent of the Dingley rates, and admitting free all other products of the Philippine Islands. The enactment of this measure has been earnestly urged by the President. It is probable that the bill making more stringent regulations governing the admission of aliens into this country will become a law.

There is no likelihood that the present Congress will undertake to pass any measure relating to the currency, although there will be no lack of suggestion as to the best methods of giving elasticity to our circulation. The anti-injunction measure so earnestly desired by organized labor is also apparently doomed, the President having declared himself in opposition to its objectionable provisions and suggested less drastic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legislation, while the leaders of the House are lukewarm as to the wisdom of its enactment. It is also certain that the tariff question will not be seriously discussed. There is a disposition to allow the railroad-rate law and the pure-food law further time for practical operation before undertaking to amend their provisions. The outlook, therefore, is for a session barren of important legislation, except in the one or two instances already referred to.

Three months, however, will allow sufficient time for indulging in talk, and many subjects will, therefore, be thoroughly threshed in debate. One of these will be the mustering out of the companies of the Twenty-fifth infantry, colored, on account of the troubles in Brownsville, Texas.

The details of this incident, which has already given rise to an unusual amount of comment, are too recent to require rehearsal here, beyond the fact that, a fatal riot having been inaugurated by the troops, and it having been found impossible to identify the guilty men, the President punished both the participators and the men who shielded them. The discussion is certain to assume a political phase, because the President's action affects the negro vote, which, in some States, is a valuable asset of the Republican party.

It would be well if this political controversy could be avoided, and the case tried upon its merits. It is the well-grounded opinion of many thoughtful men in our country that the so-called race problem would lose its importance if the negro were removed from the field of politics. The inception of the agitation of the negro question, so-called, was due to the fact that the negro had been intrusted with the ballot. In the North, his vote was needed; in the South, it was not only undesired, but resented. The situation was one that necessarily led to friction.

We cannot take away this suffrage at this late day, nor would it be fair and just to the many educated and intelligent negroes who have equipped themselves for the fullest exercise of the duties of citizenship to suggest such a deprivation. It is proper, however, to assert that the continued agitation of the negro question for political purposes is doing incalculable harm, not alone to the negro race, but to the entire country. Both white men and black men are to blame for this unfortunate situation. They are, in the main, selfish and designing men, who seek only their own advantage and have no regard either for national or racial good. The solution of the problem would be obtained if the negroes would act more independently. As the case now stands, they are a Republican contingent and are not taken into consideration by the Democratic leaders. If, however, they should divide their votes, so as to be an uncertain quantity, it seems as though they would find themselves treated with a greater degree of consideration.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The defeat of Mr. Hearst in the gubernatorial campaign in New York was, of course, the principal feature of the recent election. It is not necessary at this late day to recite the incidents of his remarkable contest, other than to say that the two episodes which contributed most largely to his defeat were the antagonistic cablegram to Mr. McCarren from Mr. Croker, and the speech delivered by Secretary Root, the latter being one of the most severe arraignments known in American political history.

In view of the fact, however, that Mr. Hearst was the only defeated candidate upon his ticket, and that Mr. Hughes, his successful competitor, was not elected by a phenomenal majority, it is evident that if the Democrats had nominated any one except Mr. Hearst they would have swept the State. The result showed that Mr. Hearst was not defeated because of the views which he entertained on matters of public policy, but rather because his personality was, to many voters, objectionable. Indeed, it was the very fact that he believed in opposition to the trusts, so-called, and posed as the friend of the masses, that gave him the vote he obtained.

If Mr. Hearst is, therefore, beyond the pale of consideration as a candidate, the principles represented by him are by no means in the same category. The great mass of voters who are discontented and restless, who view with jealousy and envy the mammoth fortunes which have been accumulated by the few, and who are determined, if possible, to bring about a more equal condition of affairs through the agency of the ballot, will not be discouraged by their failure to elect Mr. Hearst. On the contrary, they will seek another candidate, not more conservative, perhaps, but less vulnerable, and endeavor triumphantly to elect him. These forces of discontent must be reckoned with.

It was remarked during the recent campaign that there was a decadence of party spirit. This has been the tendency for some years past. More than this, the time is now at hand when party ties must set more loosely than ever if we are to continue, as a nation, in the path of conservative government. Parties may assemble in national convention, frame their platforms, and nominate their candidates; but, after all, the voters of the future must disregard party labels. The divorcement from political ties must be complete. The character of the candidates and the principles which they represent must be the determining factors at the polls. The forces of conservatism and of right must be massed together without regard to the previous political predilection of the voter. There must be an appeal to conscience, not to party spirit. Unless there is this independence on the part of the voter, we are liable to see the country plunged into serious difficulty.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President Roosevelt has seen the drift of affairs with his usual clear foresight. He has endeavored to keep the Republican party in the position where it would be commended for a rigid execution of all the laws, even though the offenders were among the rich and powerful. He has not gone beyond the laws, but he has infused new vitality into statutes that were covered with the dust of oblivion. He has endeavored to demonstrate that there are laws enough to reach the evils which arouse such universal complaint, provided some one has the courage to enforce them. He has neutralized the criticism that formerly obtained against the Republican party, that it was the friend of the rich and the powerful rather than of the unprotected, and has demonstrated that reforms can be secured without recourse to radical men and measures.

It is almost impossible to estimate the political value to the Republican party of the course which President Roosevelt has pursued; and, as a matter of fact, the future nominee of that party cannot hope for election unless he gives evidence that he will pursue the same fearless and impartial policy. The people of the United States realize that they cannot stop the accumulation of wealth; but they do know that there can be, and that there ought to be, some interposition against the exercise of unfair discrimination on the part of monopolistic corporations, whereby advantages are given to some which are not enjoyed by all. Corporations are well enough in their place; but if they deal with necessaries of life, they occupy a quasi-public position and must be made amenable to public considerations. President Roosevelt has given an earnest of what may be done along proper lines; and unless the signs of the times are strangely misleading, the people will be satisfied with nothing less.

It would seem as if the great mass of intelligent and conservative people would rather choose an honest and courageous executive, who administers the laws with fidelity and impartiality, than a radical and ambitious man, who would absolutely disregard all vested rights in his effort to regulate apparent evils. Rather than have nothing done, the voters will elect a President of the latter type; and it is this absolutely certain outcome that President Roosevelt has been endeavoring to prevent.

We have reached a point, too, in the history of the country where something more than a President of the Roosevelt mould is necessary. The Supreme Court of the United States is face to face with one of the most important periods in its history. The great prosperity of the country, with its consequent accumulation of individual and corporate wealth, has brought new problems. Any one who has read the discussions which preceded the adoption of the Federal Constitution must have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been struck by the fact that the framers of that document had no conception of the conditions which now confront us. The fundamental principles of government were considered by them with much detail. The jealousy which the smaller States might manifest toward the larger ones; the necessity for equalizing in some legislative body the differences in area and population; the adjustment of the delicate relations between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches — all these and more did the fathers of the republic anticipate and attempt to regulate.

They did not even appreciate, however, the aggregation of capital and its menace. Great financial wealth was almost unknown in those days, and even the few who possessed fortunes did not combine together to increase those fortunes at the expense of their fellow-men. In the hundred or more years which have elapsed since the adoption of the Constitution, our civilization has become more and more complex, and it is now necessary to restrict and control the vast corporations which, in some instances, monopolize avenues of trade. The exercise of this power must, necessarily, be within the limits of the Constitution; and it may be that the courts will be compelled to make some very liberal constructions of that document in order to fully protect public interests.

To my mind, the position is analogous to the time when the republic was evolving out of its experimental stage. In those days it was the broad and masterly interpretation of the Constitution by John Marshall and his colleagues which settled the United States upon a sure foundation. It will require equally wise and courageous minds to guide us safely through the maze of litigation which now threatens. Measures which are of vital import to the American people will be attacked upon the ground that they are unconstitutional. The attempt to overthrow the railroad-rate law is already outlined, while the statute guaranteeing pure food is to be subjected to powerful opposition.

The Constitution has always proved elastic enough for any emergency; and it is likely, therefore, that if necessary there will be read into it provisions which, if not expressed, are in harmony with its spirit. At any rate, very sagacious must be the minds that will not mar the wonderful symmetry of that immortal document and yet will find in it a protecting ægis for the whole people.

In this connection, it is worth while to quote the words of a writer in a current publication concerning the proposed Constitution of the new State of Oklahoma. He says:

> Watch Oklahoma. She has a chance to work out the corporation problem in words of one syllable. The Oklahoma Constitutional Convention may develop into one of the significant events of the present political-industrial crisis, for that State will be the first to construct and organize law, since the supremely im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portant question of corporation regulation and control has been recognized in its true aspect. Oklahoma has no encumbrances of the past. She can view every difficulty in the light of the latest developments. Her people are of a type accustomed to think for themselves and to act independently upon their own judgment. Capital she must have for the development of her resources. Will she take it on her own terms, regulating and restricting it for the best advantage of all the people, and yet rendering it the fair return to which it is entitled? Or will she give it free rein to corrupt her Legislature, strangle her independent industries, and exploit her many for the benefit of an alien few? What Wisconsin and Iowa have, by a vital struggle, gained in part is hers in whole. She may form where others must reform. If she can give capital that free play which it must have for normal development and still guard herself against the common encroachments of avarice, making corporate interests her servant instead of her master, the newest of the States may well become the model for her elder sisters.

There is no doubt that a remarkable opportunity is afforded the members of the Oklahoma Constitutional Convention to frame a document which shall be, in every respect, a model. The country has moved rapidly since 1896, when Utah was admitted into the Union. Many new problems have arisen, especially in relation to corporate combination, and it will devolve upon the statesmen of the new commonwealth to embody into their charter the latest expressions of wisdom resulting from experience. The outcome of their labors will be observed with interest. The opportunity for the production of a model constitution, which shall contain all the best and omit all the defects of similar documents, is certainly presented to Oklahoma.

The Presidential situation remains practically unchanged. The probability of the nomination of Mr. Bryan is increased by the defeat of Mr. Hearst, although since the former's Madison Square speech it has become evident that the Southern States do not like his advocacy of government ownership of railroads. Representative John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, the Democratic leader in the House of Representatives, recently declared in unequivocal language that the South would not support this policy. This is not, however, important, inasmuch as the South will, as usual, vote solidly for the Democratic nominee, no matter what principles he may espouse. The Southern States supported Greeley in 1872 with the same devotion that they displayed toward Cleveland in 1892, although both nominees were bitter pills to swallow.

The fact is that governmental ownership of railroads appeals to the Western section of the country and certainly meets with the approval of the voters who cast their ballots for Mr. Hearst in New York. It does not appear, therefore, that Bryan has largely decreased his chances of the Presidential nomination by his public espousal of the government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ownership idea. It has hurt him among the conservatives in his party, who are now endeavoring to unite upon some one who can wrest the nomination from him.

Their present choice is Woodrow Wilson, president of Princeton University, and a conference was recently held in New York to organize a concerted movement in his behalf. No one can question Dr. Wilson's ability or his high character. He has, moreover, considerable theoretical knowledge of political affairs, as evidenced by his volume on Congressional government and his study of the elements of historical and practical politics under the title "The State." As a general rule, however, the scholar in politics does not present an inspiring spectacle, besides which it will take considerable effort to bring Dr. Wilson prominently before the men who will control the election of delegates to the national convention. Dr. Wilson seems to be a passive instrument in the hands of friends who are determined to urge his fitness and availability. There are no indications, up to the present time, of any universal public sentiment in his behalf.

On the Republican side, no one candidate has made any marked advance during the past quarter toward the Presidential goal. A few leading members of the party, including Representative Grosvenor, of Ohio, and Senator Elkins, of West Virginia, are intimating that President Roosevelt will be forced, in spite of himself, into the Presidential race, their prediction being that the popular demand for him as a candidate will be too strong to be withstood. Notwithstanding the opinion of these two eminent gentlemen — and both are skilled politicians — the opinion is here ventured that Mr. Roosevelt will not be a candidate for the Presidency in 1908, even though the Republican party should unanimously, in national convention assembled, select him as its leader.

No one who knows President Roosevelt believes for a moment that he would be inconsistent or untrue to himself; and he has burned his bridges behind him in the matter of the Presidential nomination. He has even gone so far as to assert that he is now serving his second term as President. This point is open to discussion, inasmuch as he has only been once elected to the Presidency; but the very fact that he regards this term as his second would give to his political opponents the opportunity to charge him with seeking a third term, a charge which, in itself, would defeat the most popular President who ever served in the White House. There is no doubt that Mr. Roosevelt is not only sincere in his declaration, but that he has deliberately barred himself from consideration. The race to succeed him is still open. There are any number of available candidates, with no one so preëminently the logical candidate as to make prediction even worth while.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The effort of the leaders of organized labor to adversely affect the political future of certain candidates for Congress did not meet with much success. The campaign of President Gompers, of the Federation of Labor, against Representative Littlefield, of Maine, resulted, as indicated in the last issue of THE FORUM, in a defeat of the former; and when the returns from all the Congressional districts were received after the 7th of November, it was even more apparent that the workingmen of the country had declined to recognize the political factorship with which Mr. Gompers had endeavored to invest them.

Speaker Cannon, in particular, had been marked for defeat. It was directly charged, for instance, that it had been impossible for labor to receive a square deal at his hands. His alleged antagonistic position was made the subject of several formal statements which were widely circulated through his district. Mr. Cannon made one speech in answer to his critics, and then spent nearly the entire anteëlection period in campaigning through a score of States. He was returned to Congress by a majority above the usual figures. Representative Sidney Mudd, of Maryland, who was also an especial object of attack, was reëlected by an increased majority. In some districts the opposition of organized labor reduced the favorable vote for Representatives; but, upon the whole, the labor campaign was not a success.

It is difficult to understand why this should have been the result. The workingmen of the United States, if they should stand together at the ballot-box, would be a tremendous factor in deciding results. They have numbers and organization. In many States and Congressional districts they would undoubtedly hold the balance of power if they voted *en masse*. The fact that never have they thus undertaken to use their great strength is one of the curious features in American politics. It may be that they are too independent. It may be that they mistrust their leaders, or perhaps they resent the insinuation that they can be led like dumb cattle to the polls. Whatever the reason, the fact remains that no effort to vote the American workingmen as a political unit has yet succeeded.

It seems to me that the real explanation lies in the fact that, up to the present time, the national legislators have not displayed opposition to the reasonable propositions of American labor. Everything has not been done that radical labor leaders have demanded; but, upon the whole, consideration for the workingmen has not been lacking. If the time should come when labor should be turned away from the door of Congress without a hearing, meeting nothing but absolute indifference and scorn, it is probable that it would be driven by the force of such circumstance into effective solidity. This time has not, however, yet arrived, nor is it likely to occur. There is too much political sagacity in Congress to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

warrant the prediction that organized labor will be antagonized to the extent of totally ignoring all its claims.

One of the most remarkable suggestions which have been made as the result of the agitation for a revision of the tariff is that Republican revisionists in the Sixtieth Congress should unite with the Democrats and elect a low-tariff speaker in opposition to Mr. Cannon.

The scheme sounds so plausible that it is not surprising that it has received considerable editorial attention throughout the country and that it is especially favored by those who are sincerely interested in securing a change of schedules. A moment's consideration of the logical outcome of such a combination will demonstrate, however, its utter impracticability. In the first place, a speaker thus elected would occupy the impossible position of being compelled to serve two masters. He would be compelled to recognize the fact that he owed his elevation to Democratic voters, and, in the appointment of his committees, and especially of the Committee on Ways and Means, would be forced, unless a political ingrate, to listen to Democratic counsel.

Even if this first abnormal condition could be successfully encountered, the tariff bill which the committee would report would be of necessity a mongrel affair, unsatisfactory alike to Republicans and Democrats. Its enactment by the House of Representatives, if accomplished, would be a matter of grave difficulty and after much criticism and an undesirable exhibition of party feeling. Finally, should the bill go to the Senate, it would be received there as the product of an ill-assorted union and would either be pigeon-holed or returned to the House so amended as to preclude the possibility of agreement between the two branches.

Thus analyzed, the proposal to elect a speaker in favor of tariff revision by a Republican-Democratic combination does not appeal to common-sense. Not only does it present insuperable difficulties, but it supposes that the Republicans will go before the country presenting the spectacle of a house divided against itself. The history of the Republican majority in previous Congresses does not warrant the belief that this supposition rests upon a sure foundation. Time and time again we have heard rumors of great results to be accomplished by the alliance of Republican "insurgents" with the Democratic minority; and each time the vote has shown that the alleged widespread defection was confined to an insignificant few. It is not to be imagined that any large number of Republicans, no matter how anxious they may be to secure a revision of the tariff, will align themselves with the Democratic minority to obtain that result.

The reassembling of Congress for a brief session invites attention to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a curious anomaly in the operation of our government. Among those who have returned to Washington to participate in proceedings of the closing months are many men upon whom the seal of political death has already been set. Their fate was settled in November and they linger superfluous on the stage.

Some time in the future, when Congress is run upon business principles even at the expense of some traditional ideas, the new session will begin immediately after an election. As the case now stands, a Representative chosen last November will not be sworn in and take his seat until the first Monday in December, 1907, thirteen months after he has been elected. In the mean time the issues which were uppermost at the time of his election may have faded away, and conditions are almost certain to have been changed.

It borders upon absurdity to have Congress assemble thirteen months after its members have been elected; and yet this continually occurs, unless an extraordinary session is convened. A new Congress should begin on the first Monday in December, when its personnel is fresh from the people, and then its final adjournment would very properly come just before the campaign opens for the next election. Suppose, for instance, that the first session of the present Congress had aroused popular antagonism by unwise action. Nearly two years would elapse before the successor could undertake to correct its evil work. It would be much better if each Congress could appeal to the people at the conclusion of its session, and its successor promptly organized almost immediately after the ballots have been cast.

More than once the last three months of a session have witnessed the assembling of a House of Representatives in which more than a majority of its members have had no vital interest in the proceedings, their political careers having been ended ere they returned to Washington. Quite frequently, the members who have thus been defeated do not even take the trouble to resume their seats, an indifference perhaps unpardonable, but none the less natural. Even those who are conscientious enough to endeavor to earn their salaries cannot be expected to be over-zealous. The system is entirely wrong, and ought to be corrected. The new Congress should come into existence as soon as possible after an election has taken place, and not thirteen months later, as is now the case.

The method whereby this change can be effected ought to be easily evolved. The Federal Constitution provides that "the Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they by law appoint a different day." Congress could enact a law assembling the new Congress on the 4th of March. The work of the session could then be commenced and con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

siderable progress made before adjournment for the summer in June or July. After a brief recess, Congress could reassemble in October, and before the two-years' term had elapsed its programme could have been thoroughly executed. Under this arrangement the sessions of Congress could be more equitably divided.

At present a Representative chosen for two years very rarely spends even half that time in the halls of Congress. His term begins on the 4th of March, but he does not take his seat until December. He then serves until May or June, a period of six or seven months, after which he returns home, to remain until December, when he again takes his seat for a three-months' session. If he is not reëlected, his effective service may possibly be confined to the few months of the first session.

It does not require argument to prove that this is not an ideal situation. Indeed, one is almost tempted to endorse the English system, whereby the popular branch of the national legislature remains in power as long as it renders satisfactory service to the country. If a Parliament fails to sustain the Government, there is an immediate appeal to the people, who vote upon the issue presented, and whose decision is instantly reflected in the new Parliament which convenes. There is much to be commended in this system. It is in line with business practice, which retains efficient directors or managers as long as they prove their capacity and integrity. If such a system were in vogue in this country, we would have fewer elections, and they would depend upon vital issues rather than upon the recurrence of an arbitrary date.

With our conservatism and reverence for tradition, we are not likely to see the English custom adopted here; but we ought to have something better than an arrangement which insures only ten or twelve months' service in Congress out of a two-years' term, with three months of that time occurring after the possible political decapitation of the Representative.

HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THERE has been a dramatic sequel to the rehabilitation of Captain Dreyfus. It will be recalled that in the last number of this Review the story was told of the arrest, trial, and conviction of Captain Alfred Dreyfus for betraying French military secrets to Germany; his degradation and banishment to the Island of the Devil; his return to France to stand a new trial, evidence having been discovered to show that he was the victim of a plot; and his complete exoneration and restoration to his former rank in the army. Dreyfus mainly owed his rehabilitation to General Picquart, who, as chief of one of the divisions of the General Staff, was clearly convinced of the innocence of Dreyfus. Picquart was the one man among all the officers connected with that infamous affair who was determined to see justice done, who had the courage of his convictions, and who, for the sake of truth and justice, proved incorruptible and paid a heavy price for his devotion. When his chiefs found that they could not use him as a tool he was retired from the army, and the career of one of the best soldiers in France was brought to an abrupt close.

The Sarrien Cabinet fell in October, and Clémenceau formed a new government, the portfolio of the Minister of War being offered to Picquart. Nothing perhaps illustrates that marvellous change in the French character of recent years, to which reference has more than once been made in these pages, than the fact that this offer should have been made and that it should have been received by the French people without that display of emotion which would have characterized its announcement a decade ago.

When the appointment was gazetted there was at first a slight feeling of apprehension, a feeling quite natural that Picquart's accession to the War Office meant the reopening of the Dreyfus affair, and that Picquart would avail himself of his power to punish his enemies. Ten years ago the Boulevards would have rung with excited and gesticulating mobs denouncing Clémenceau and Picquart, and the yellow press of Paris would have deluged those unfortunates with their choicest Billingsgate. The whole world would have been nervous fearing for the outcome. But the appointment was discussed with little, if any, more vehemence than a similar appointment would have been discussed in the United

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States or in England, and in both countries members of the cabinet are freely criticised.

To the great mass of the French people, I believe, the appointment has given satisfaction. It indicates progression, moderation, efficient administration. It is a rebuke to those persons who were wilfully blind during the Dreyfus affair and attempted to use it for narrow party advantage. Instead of reopening old wounds it closes them forever; it is an announcement that the past is forgotten and will not be revived. Picquart has not begun his administration by avenging himself on the men who were the means of his humiliation. A man of high character, strong convictions, and fine abilities, he is content to go forward, and not backward. And France no longer trembles.

Clémenceau, the most interesting figure in modern French politics, who has destroyed more cabinets than he has made, at last comes into his own. The sobering influence of power and responsibility exercises its restraint in France as it does in the United States. We have seen in this country men very violent and radical in opposition become moderate and conservative when clothed with office. When last March Clémenceau entered the Sarrien Cabinet as Minister of the Interior, the Radicals and Socialists claimed it as a great triumph for their cause, for Clémenceau had always sat on the Extreme Left, and, in the eyes of the French conservatives and moderates, was as extreme as was Tom Watson in those days when the Populists were a political power and controlled the destinies of more than one State. Clémenceau as minister was to carry out the policies that Clémenceau as journalist and deputy had so long preached; the time was come when "equality" was no longer to be a theoretic aspiration, but a practical fact established by law.

Clémenceau as a minister was a disappointment — to the party of the Left. He had been in office only a short time when France was convulsed with labor difficulties that threatened serious consequences if not promptly dealt with. It was a rare opportunity for a weak and timid man to palter and temporize and bring the country almost to the verge of anarchy; for a man of strength and courage it was an even greater opportunity to crush anarchy at the outset and compel respect for the law. Clémenceau's friends measured the man and made a mistake. He would not dare, they said, to turn on his old supporters and deal with the Socialists as he would with any other insignificant violators of the law; for politically there was too much at stake, and politically Clémenceau was ambitious and would not destroy himself at the very beginning of his administration.

But he quickly showed them their mistake. Under his direction

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

troops were drafted to Paris until the capital was a great armed camp and there was force enough to suppress any attempt to subvert the lawful authority. But the use of force was not necessary; its mere display was sufficient to inspire respect. There was no riot, and no disorder; not a single shot was fired. The Socialists considered that they had been betrayed by Clémenceau, but the country recognized in him a man of courage and gave him its trust.

The new Premier came into office with a clear mandate from the country. France, it has been made quite clear by repeated parliamentary elections, desires the complete separation of Church and State, but at the same time it does not desire that the law shall be executed with harshness or vindictively or that a religious conflict shall be provoked. Permitted to have their own way, the Socialists, the party of the Extreme Left, would enforce the law with the utmost vigor, showing to the church no consideration and rejoicing if force had to be employed to compel obedience to the law.

Clémenceau has now become a "conservative radical," to whom compromise and conciliation are as attractive as unyielding adherence to a fixed principle was when he first entered public life, more than thirty years ago. He is placed in a position that requires the exercise of great tact and firmness; and while he may wisely ignore the non-essentials, the principle involved must be rigidly maintained. In many respects, his position is not unlike that of Count Witte when he was called by the Czar to the head of affairs and endeavored to bring about constitutional government in Russia. Witte lost the support of the Liberals because he counselled conciliation and moderation and discouraged those extreme methods which the opponents of autocracy deemed the only proper methods to employ.

Clémenceau can expect no support from the Socialists — who are always a party of opposition and always against whoever may be for the time in power — any more than he can look for encouragement to the Clericals; and yet I believe he may count upon the great mass of the French people if he pursues a moderate course and executes the law without unnecessary harshness or displaying petty tyranny. What France wants more than anything else is peace and order. The spirit of the people is opposed to religious strife.

At the same time, the French Catholic hierarchy would be fatuously blind if it could not see that moderation was one thing, and failure to enforce the law another. The Church has believed that fear of consequences would stay the hands of the authorities, but now they must know how empty is that hope. In a speech in the Senate recently, the Prime Minister said that in giving orders for inventories of church property to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taken in compliance with the law, the insinuation had been made that he was inviting civil war. To this Clémenceau replied with much spirit that he had given the same orders and for the same objects when, as Minister of the Interior, he suppressed the miners' strikes, namely, to be patient to the end, but with the positive determination that force must remain on the side of the law. His use of the army was objected to, but he significantly replied:

> I must employ the army to enforce respect for the law, and I will have the law respected as well by Catholics as by strikers. We do not wish the Catholics to profit by our patience to put themselves in revolt. I have taken the necessary measures.

This great question of separation of Church and State in France is really so little understood in this country that the concise declaration made by M. Briand, the Minister of Public Worship, who is charged with the execution of the law, will no doubt be read with interest. He said:

> What is it that we have desired? What is it that this republican country has decreed? It has decreed four great things. It has decreed in the first place the absolute neutrality of the state among all existing forms of belief, to the extent of forever abolishing all pretence of a state church. It has decreed, in the second place, the abrogation of the Concordat, which means the rupture once and for all of the tie which has connected it with Rome. It has decreed in the third place to abolish public support of public worship, and subsidizing by the public of the priests of any religion. It has decreed in the fourth place to abolish the privilege which, in virtue of the Concordat, certain Frenchmen have possessed in their character of priests. This means that all French citizens are equal before the law, having the same rights and the same duties.

In the Chamber of Deputies M. Briand made this declaration:

> The Catholic Church having simply declined to take advantage of its privilege under the Separation Law, as other religions have done, will on December 11 forfeit its 400,000,000 francs of property and thereafter come under the common law. No martyrdoms or persecutions will be possible. The churches, as state and communal property, will remain open for Catholic worship. The state will no longer support any religion; priests will no longer enjoy special privileges. They will be on an equality with other citizens. The state will have established its absolute neutrality toward all religions. That is all.

I am very firmly of the opinion that the Catholic Church will establish a *modus vivendi* with the French Government and that the friction so much feared will not manifest itself. That both parties to the agreement will profit by it, that the cause of religion as well as the cause of good government will gain by the complete divorcement of spiritual and temporal authority, is little open to question. For proof we need only to look to the United States to see how the Catholic Church has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

widened its power and increased its usefulness without state aid or attempting to exercise political influence.

The foreign policy of the Clémenceau Ministry will not differ from that of his predecessors of recent years. The Anglo-French *entente* is now so firmly established and gives so much satisfaction to both countries that there will be no weakening of the bonds of political friendship, which may at any time become even more closely knit by a formal treaty of alliance. With or without treaties France will continue to be the friend of both England and Italy as she is now the ally and banker of Russia; and while endeavoring not to provoke Germany to hostilities, she will continue to mistrust and watch her as the menace to her peace. So long as the neutrality of England, Italy, and Russia is assured, France need not fear that Germany will provoke her.

The break between the Liberal Government in England and the Labor party in the House of Commons grows wider, and it may not be long before labor is as openly and defiantly the enemy of the Government as are its acknowledged opponents, the Conservatives. It is the old fable over again of the camel and the herder's hut. At the last general election, the Liberals were glad to support Labor candidates in many constituencies to defeat the Conservative candidates, and the Labor candidates, like the camel, merely wanted to get their head through the door. But now that they are once in the house they are crowding the Liberal majority pretty hard until the Government sees that it must either surrender to the Labor party or assert its independence and defy it.

Meanwhile the Government has found encouragement in the internal differences of the Labor party. The extreme Socialism of Keir Hardie and his wing has disgusted the more conservative men, the leader of whom is Richard Bell, the secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, one of the most powerful trade-unions in the country. Mr. Bell has been a member of Parliament for several years, and both in Parliament and as the executive of his union has shown great sanity in the discussion of all questions affecting the cause of labor.

The attempt on the part of the Socialists to commit the Labor party to an avowed Socialistic programme is repugnant to Bell and his followers, who believe that it will do the cause incalculable harm. It is not at all improbable that within a year or two there will be two labor groups in British politics, one, to borrow the French term, the "party of the Extreme Left," led by Keir Hardie; the other, the "party of the Moderate Centre," with such men as Bell and John Burns, when he retires from the Cabinet, as its leaders.

The action of the House of Lords in amending the Education bill so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as to force the Commons to refuse to accept it in its amended form is not quite so bitterly resented by Prime Minister Bannerman as some of his supporters try to represent. A great deal of nonsense has been written in the American press about the House of Lords defying public opinion, as if the House of Lords held the same place in the British Parliamentary system that the Senate does in the American and could prevent legislation enacted by the Commons. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman has the remedy in his own hands if he has the courage to use it. If he really believes that the country approves the Education bill, all he has to do is to dissolve Parliament; and if he should be returned to power with a strong majority again pass the bill, and send it to the Lords, that body would be bound to accept it.

But the truth is, Sir Henry does not dare to test public sentiment in this way. He has a phenomenal majority in the Commons and does not propose to take any chances of having that majority cut down, which it most assuredly would be, as every party is weaker after having been in office than it is on the crest of opposition. It is not within the limits of probability that the Conservatives would carry the country if an election were to be held within the next few months, as the English Conserservatives are disorganized and without a strong fighting leader; but they would unquestionably make gains. Prime Minister Bannerman is playing much better politics than to make an immediate test of strength.

The Lords have not only objected to the Education bill, but they also are expected to throw out other measures sent to them by the Lower House, especially measures in which labor is vitally interested and which were passed by the Liberals to keep the Labor party from going over to the opposition. By piling up grievances against the Lords, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is accumulating most excellent campaign material when the time comes to appeal to the country, which will not be for at least five years, unless by a series of incredible blunders the Prime Minister should forfeit the confidence of the House.

If Socialism increases in England — and many careful observers of British politics believe it will — nothing could be better for the Liberals in the next campaign than an attack on the House of Lords for trying to defeat the popular will; and even if there is no increase of Socialism, as the Liberal party appeals more directly to the democracy than to the aristocracy, to make the House of Lords an issue is in line with the prevailing sentiment of the party.

For the present at least, possibly for the next year or two, there is not likely to be any marked change in the relations between Liberals and Laborites, except that the breach will widen and from time to time things will happen to increase the friction. The London borough elec-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions held in November were a smashing defeat for the Liberals, and the unexpected Unionist success encouraged them to believe that the tide is running as strongly in their favor as only a few years ago it ran against them. Probably that sanguine opinion is not justified, but these local elections are not without significance. In many London boroughs a combination was effected between Unionists and Liberals to defeat Labor candidates, not so much on political grounds, but to bring about a reform in municipal administration and greater economy in management.

For some years past the citizens of London have complained of the heavy taxes levied upon them and the reckless extravagance of the county and borough councils. Municipal enterprises that no city in this country would dare to undertake have been carried out in England; and as the lower and middle classes are the beneficiaries, while the upper classes have to pay the cost, there has naturally been a revolt.

In many respects London is the best governed city in the world; but it is also the most expensively governed city, and it is not surprising that the law-makers can afford to be generous when their generosity costs them nothing. Municipal street-car lines and municipal steamboats on the Thames run at a heavy loss; and other conveniences of the same kind are very satisfactory to the people who use them, but decidedly exasperating to the people who never use them but are taxed for their support.

In Parliament the boot is on the other leg. There the workingmen's representatives pose as the watch-dogs of the treasury and oppose great expenditures for imperial purposes, while the men who belong to and are representative of the great landed and property interests willingly vote whatever sums may be needed for the proper support and defence of the Empire. As a rule, Liberal governments have always gone in for retrenchment and reform, while Conservative administrations have increased the budget to meet the always increasing demands of imperialism.

Not since the German Emperor dismissed Prince Bismarck from the chancellorship of the Empire has such a profound sensation been created in European politics as the publication of Prince Hohenlohe's memoirs giving the reason for that dismissal. They add nothing to the character or reputation of that modern Machiavelli, but they increase the admiration one must have for William II.

It has long been believed, although there has never been any official authority for the belief, that the Kaiser "dropped the pilot" shortly after his accession to the throne because he was convinced that Bismarck intended to be the real ruler of Germany, and the Kaiser was equally

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

determined that so long as he sat on the throne he would not only reign, but govern. Prince Hohenlohe, whose memoirs, perhaps, are a "blazing indiscretion," but at the same time a most valuable contribution to contemporary history, removes all doubt as to the motives which controlled the Kaiser.

Driving to the imperial shooting-box, the Kaiser unburdened himself to Prince Hohenlohe and told him of the causes leading to the break.

"The last three weeks of Bismarck's chancellorship," the Prince writes, "were full of disagreeable discussions between the Emperor and the Prince. It was, as the Emperor himself put it, 'a beastly time,' and as the Emperor further remarked, the question had been whether the Hohenzollern dynasty or the Bismarck dynasty was going to govern. As to foreign policy the Emperor asserts that Bismarck went his own way and kept a great deal from his knowledge. Indeed, he says that Bismarck sent word to St. Petersburg that the Emperor wanted to pursue an anti-Russsian policy. 'I have no proof of this, however,' added the Emperor."

Other questions equally as important caused friction between the King and his first minister. One of the first things the Chancellor wanted the Emperor to do after he came to the throne was to give his sanction to the enactment of repressive labor measures aimed at the Socialists, and if the Reichstag should refuse to sanction Bismarck's programme he threatened to dissolve the legislature, "and if disturbances ensued to deal with them energetically," which meant turning the army loose on the people. To this the Emperor would not consent. He opposed this policy, Prince Hohenlohe writes, "because," he said, "if his grandfather after a long and glorious reign had been compelled to take action against rioters no one would have taken it amiss. But with himself, who had not yet achieved anything, the case was different. He would be taunted with having begun his reign by shooting down his subjects. He was quite ready to act, but he wanted to be able to do it with a good conscience after trying his best to remedy the legitimate grievances of the working classes."

This puts the Emperor in rather a different light from that in which he has generally stood before the world. He has been accused of being rash, impetuous, heartless, filled with his self-importance, and caring nothing for the welfare of his subjects so long as he might magnify himself. Rather, we see him here as a man to whom his people were very dear, who was strong enough and courageous enough to defy the creator of United Germany, and to whom the thought of inaugurating his reign by a massacre of his subjects was abhorrent. To Bismarck this was mere sentiment, and Bismarck was always a man of blood and iron.

Prince Hohenlohe relates how Prince Radolin took Prince Bismarck to see Emperor Frederick just before his death. At the moment, Bis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

marck appeared to be moved, but when he returned afterward to his room Prince Radolin remarked, "It has been very affecting," to which Bismarck rejoined, "I cannot follow sentimental policy now." This remark is the key-note to the man's character. He had no time for sentiment and no inclination to follow a sentimental policy. He had a certain definite purpose to accomplish, and he would permit nothing, no consideration of sentiment or humanity, to stand in his way.

In matters of foreign policy also the Kaiser and Bismarck clashed. Bismarck wanted to ignore Germany's treaty relations with Austria, and form an alliance with Russia, which was believed at that time to have designs on Bulgaria. The Emperor opposed this and pointed out that a military occupation of Bulgaria by Russia would mean war with Austria, and the Emperor was determined to support Austria even if it involved Germany in war with Russia and France. There is reason to believe that Bismarck, who always encouraged the idea of a close understanding between Russia and Germany because of the geographical position of the two countries, later decided that it was not wise to risk a break with Austria, and it was these peculiar tactics of his Chancellor that caused the Emperor so much uneasiness. The Emperor charged that Bismarck was trying to keep him in ignorance of what was being done and that he frequently acted without authority.

That Prince Bismarck was in some ways a genius no one will deny, but in his make-up ethics played no part. He was a man with one fixed idea — that idea being the greatness of Germany and her dominance in the world's affairs; and to accomplish that end he would stop at nothing. If war was more effectual than diplomacy, let it be war; if after making an alliance he betrayed his ally, well, that might be embarrassing for the ally, but so long as Germany gained by the arrangement Bismarck had no scruples. The game of statecraft as he viewed it was a game that admitted of no sentiment, no strict regard for morality, no consideration, of the effect on others. It was the bold, unscrupulous, audacious, brutally selfish player who won.

Bismarck disliked both England and the United States, but from different motives. In England he recognized a rival; of the might of England he was afraid; there was the fear that England might checkmate his ambitious schemes. The moral weight of the United States was always disturbing to his calculations. The Bismarckian policy could only be successful in an autocracy, in a country where one man had supreme power and need pay little deference to public opinion. The Germans settled in the United States learned, and through them their countrymen at home, the real meaning of political liberty and the power of self-government. America stood as an example of all that was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good in political democracy, in marked contrast to the exercise of arbitrary power centred in the hands of one man in Germany. Bismarck was clear-headed enough to perceive that the influence of the United States would continue to increase and would injuriously affect, from his standpoint, the German mind; and his dislike of the United States he more than once made manifest.

Some of the Continental journals point out that although the Kaiser broke with Bismarck in 1890, Bismarckian traditions have since been revived under Prince Bülow, and that the diplomacy of Emperor William in these days is little if any different from what it was at the time when Bismarck was at the height of his power. This does the Emperor an injustice. That he is ambitious to make Germany one of the great ruling forces of the world, if not the greatest, is of course admitted, and the ambitions of a nation, like those of an individual, are bound to arouse the envy of rivals, especially of those rivals who see in the gratification of ambitions a menace to themselves or who are jealous of success.

The position of Germany at the close of the Franco-Prussian war was an extremely delicate one. France, of course, was bitterly hostile; England, at heart, was more sympathetically inclined toward the vanquished than the victor; Sadowa was still too fresh in the Austrian mind; the creation of a great military power on her flank could not be viewed by Russia without concern. Germany at once turned her attention to commerce, and made giant strides, always carefully watching France, of whom she was suspicious, as she feared France waited only the fitting time to revenge her humiliation.

England at that time pursued the policy of "splendid isolation." It was the glory of her people and the boast of her statesmen that she neither sought nor granted alliances; that behind the bulwarks of the silvery sea she need seek no ally to help her resist invasion or repel aggression. When the secret diplomatic history of Europe of the last quarter of the nineteenth century shall come to be written, it will doubtless be found that Germany more than once during the decade following the close of the war with France sued England for an alliance, and that England rejected her offers. This perhaps explains the intense bitterness that has grown up in Germany against England, the envy of the governing class of Germany for England, and perhaps justifies the statement of an English writer that "the whole official class and all who come under its influence — that is in Germany the whole upper class and five-sixths of the other classes — were systematically educated into hatred and contempt of England."

Germany believed that her safety and her future as a world power demanded that she should have the material and moral support of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England, and England refused to give it, a refusal that must have intensely humiliated and angered a man so proud and so self-centred as the German Emperor. What more natural than that the German Emperor should have longed for the day to revenge the blow to his pride, when he could show England that the alliance she once refused was all that stood between her and destruction?

That day has not yet come. England is stronger now than she has been at any time since the Emperor ascended the throne; but it explains the Krüger telegram, it explains why Germany hoped for the success of the Boers, it explains the support given to Russia during the war with Japan, it explains the ultimatum to France that led to the retirement of M. Delcassé. And as England has abandoned her policy of "splendid isolation" and has made alliances and compacts with other nations, she has forced Germany to stand alone, and in her isolation regret a policy which has resulted only in making enemies of nations that otherwise would gladly have been her friends.

Coincidently with the announcement from Rome that the Triple Alliance has been renewed for a further period of six years, it is reported both from London and Paris that a new triple alliance has been brought into being, and that a "military convention," which is in substance a defensive alliance, has been concluded between Great Britain, France, and Italy. Obviously both reports cannot be true, because Italy is a party to the Triple Alliance, which includes Austria and Germany, and cannot therefore enter into a new alliance one of the purposes of which is hostile to Germany. A semi-explanation of this seeming inconsistency is offered by the statement that the new alliance becomes effective when the Triple Alliance ceases "either by expiration of time or by any other cause."

The existence of the new alliance has been officially denied, or rather it has not been affirmed, which is not always the same thing in diplomacy. The British Foreign Office, perhaps the most reticent in Europe and the most indifferent to newspaper reports, dismisses the matter lightly; its attitude is very much that of a great trust magnate who objects to publicity except when publicity will help his schemes. Prime Minister Clémenceau was interpellated in the Senate and evasively replied that he had been too short a time in office to know whether the report was true or false. It would be a fair assumption from these cautious replies that if the "military convention" is not already *fait accompli*, it is within measurable distance of becoming so.

Assuming then, that England, France, and Italy have reached an understanding to act together in case one of them is attacked by any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

single power or a combination of powers, the most important action to perserve the equilibrium of Europe has been taken in the last quarter of a century, or since the German-Austrian-Italian alliance was concluded twenty-four years ago, and which, it is only proper to say, has been one of the strongest influences in preserving the peace of Europe. The new league is a "league of peace;" it is strictly for defensive and not aggressive purposes; and it almost completes the task to which King Edward has devoted himself since his accession — the placing of the peace of the world on a basis so firm that it will endure.

If England, France, and Italy are leagued to keep the peace they can prevent the aggression of Germany, Austria, and Russia; and Russia for the time being may be left out of calculations, as her domestic situation is too desperate to make it probable that she will have either the inclination or the means to engage in military adventures. Nor is the position of Austria much better so long as extreme bitterness, at times amounting almost to civil war, exists in the Dual Monarchy. Germany is the one power of which the other Continental powers stand most in fear; but Germany will think long and earnestly before attacking single-handed a combination so powerful as that of England, France, and Italy.

Whenever this alliance becomes operative it is more than likely that Russia will join it or at least retain her neutrality so long as it does not enable Austria to extend her authority in the Balkans. One of the advantages to Austria of the Triple Alliance has been the moral support it gave her when Russia sought to find in Southeastern Europe a pretext to add to her empire and bring her nearer to the goal of Peter the Great — Constantinople. For the present, at least, perhaps for many years to come, that menace does not threaten Austria; therefore the Triple Alliance ceases to have its former importance.

It has been frequently pointed out by this writer that the natural alliance of Italy was with France rather than with either Germany or Austria, and that Italy has far more to gain by cultivating close relations with France than she can expect from either of the other two Powers, unless she regarded an alliance with Austria as a policy of insurance. It is a curious thing how deep-seated is the sentimental affection of a nation for territory once possessed. To Austrians of this and the last generation, Venice ought to mean nothing except as it recalls a somewhat interesting chapter in history; and yet the Austrians have never quite forgiven Italy for their loss or perhaps quite relinquished the hope of regaining it.

There is said to exist a strong anti-Italian feeling in Austria, a feeling so strong that at one time during the past summer it was believed the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Austrian Government was willing to take advantage of it to distract attention from domestic affairs, even if there was no intention of seriously fomenting trouble; and the Austrian Government as the ally of Italy could not officially encourage hostility toward Italy. If Italy deserted the old Triple Alliance to join the new, Austria, of course, would be under no compunction not to wound Italy's feelings; but Austria would be very timid about provoking hostilities if she knew she must meet not Italy alone, but also England and France.

When last year the tension over Morocco led many persons to think that Germany was merely seeking a pretext again to make war on France, the question where France would find an ally was seriously discussed. Russia was not taken into account as she was in too badly shattered a condition to make her alliance formidable, and at that time Germany did not believe that England was prepared to support France with her military and naval strength. But Italy was counted upon to give France her assistance, whereupon the Germans began to estimate the increased difficulties that would follow if they had to fight two Powers instead of one; and their conclusion was, or at least they wanted the world to understand it, that France with the aid of Italy was still not a match for German arms. With forces so nearly evenly balanced, no nation is going to run the risk of war unless war is the only alternative.

The change of government in France may perhaps enable the German Emperor, if he really desires it, to bring about better relations with his neighbors across the Rhine, as M. Clémenceau has very significantly extended an olive branch. To Herr Theodore Wolf, who has for many years been the Paris correspondent of the Berlin *Tageblatt*, and who has recently become its editor, M. Clémenceau said:

> I am averse to war, and when one is adverse to war one desires good relations, so that if the relations leave something to be desired one is willing to improve them. That is my *état d'esprit*. I shall rejoice if the opportunity is afforded me to act in this sense. Naturally one must always retain one's strength and be prepared for everything; but that does not say that one wishes for war, on the contrary. One would have to be demented to desire a war. It is because we think thus that we dismissed M. Delcassé, who did not in any way desire war, but whose policy might have led to war. A war would be for all states something uncertain and unknown — an indefinable catastrophe; no one can foretell how such a war would result, what it would lead to, and how it would end. It would be quite impossible for us to pursue a belligerent policy, since Parliament would at once hunt us from office as it did M. Delcassé, and the entire people would be against us. I hope that you will continue to labor in conjunction with others for the improvement of the relations between the two countries; that is the task that I also shall set myself.

There is always a "crisis" in Austrian affairs, for Austria during the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

last ten years has lived under the perpetual shadow of fierce hatred between the Austrian and Hungarian parliaments, and there have been repeated attacks on ministers to drive them out of office for some real or imaginary wrong. We have had in the past three months the usual "crisis." In October, Count Goluchowski, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, resigned, and was succeeded by Baron Aehrenthal, formerly Austrian ambassador to Italy. Count Goluchowski's retirement was not due to his having forfeited the confidence of the Emperor or because he had lost his authority with Parliament, but was a sequel of the never-ending and ceaseless efforts of the Hungarians to obtain a larger share of the "rights" to which they consider themselves entitled and out of which they claim they are defrauded by Austria.

Count Goluchowski resigned because he believed he was to be attacked in the Hungarian Delegation when he presented his annual statement of the foreign affairs of the monarchy and asked for the approval of his budget. The members, he was given to understand, were to take advantage of his presence not only to attack his policy, but also to attack him personally; to protest against the system which excludes Hungary from having as much voice in the foreign policy of the Empire as Austria; and to demand assurances that the grievances complained of would be remedied. Rather than face his critics and submit to humiliation he resigned, and the "crisis" was quickly met by the Emperor's appointment of his successor, that wonderful old Emperor again showing that despite his age he is still the master mind of his country.

This constant clash between the two parts of the Dual Kingdom shows how tenuous is the tie that binds the Empire. Between the Austrians and the Hungarians there is nothing in common, and it is only the accident of politics that unites them under one crown. There is no common language, no common religion, no common origin; nothing to make them one people with one purpose. Hungary would gladly have dissolved the union in 1848 and was only prevented by the force of arms, but the lapse of time has not made her become more reconciled to a partnership which she affects to believe is of greater advantage to Austria than it is to herself. Politically and in every other way I believe Hungary profits by the arrangement; but the intense jealousy that the Hungarians have for the Austrians, their quickness to resent every imaginary slight, and their never-ending demands for a larger voice in the government and policy of the Empire keep the country in a constant state of turmoil and at times almost throw it into anarchy.

The political system of Austria-Hungary, which is unlike that of any other country, is provocative of friction and cumbersome to the last degree. Each kingdom has its own parliament and its own set of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ministers who exercise power within their respective countries; but in matters affecting the interests of both kingdoms jointly, that is the Empire as a whole, the necessary authority must be obtained from a joint legislature composed of 120 members selected in equal proportions by the two parliaments. Although this is a joint assembly, the two bodies carry on their debates separately; German being the official language used in the Austrian Delegation, and Magyar in the Hungarian, and they vote separately, except in the case of a deadlock, when a joint vote may be taken, but no debate is permitted. So long as Austria-Hungary clings to this unpractical system so long will there be friction between the two kingdoms.

The new Russian Duma, we are now told, is to meet on the fifth of next March. Certain formalities are yet to be observed before the election is ordered; and until it is precisely known what restrictions are to be placed upon the free choice of selection, it will be impossible to determine whether the new Duma is really a popular assemblage or has been carefully packed by adroit manipulation to masquerade as the people's parliament while, as a matter of fact, it carries out the edicts of imperial authority.

Both in Russia and on the Continent of Europe the good intentions of the Czar and his ministers are regarded with cynicism, as the reactionary policy of the Government ever since the abrupt dissolution of the Duma has not tended to convince the world that the Czar intends to give his people political liberty and full freedom of expression. We must know now in a short time. If the second Duma is to be as helpless as the first and have as little power, the Czar will not have succeeded in stifling the demand of his people for political liberty. The agitation will go on, and it must continue until at last that which the people demand is given to them.

It seems utterly incredible that the Czar and his entourage should be so blind to their own interests. More than anything else Russia needs foreign capital and foreign energy, the coöperation and assistance of England, the United States, and the rest of the world in the development of her enormous natural resources. So long as the world is uncertain whether Russia will remain a monarchy or between night and morning become a republic, in which all existing laws may be annulled and all obligations incurred by the monarchy repudiated, capital is too timid to risk investment in Russia. With domestic tranquillity assured, foreign capital would quickly flow in; and as business and politics always go hand in hand, in the case of England the establishment of mutually satisfactory political relations would follow.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is a strong feeling in England that the differences between England and Russia that have for so long kept the two countries apart can be reconciled without very great difficulty and to the great advantage of both. Once again, if Russia had only sense enough to see her own interests she would understand that now is the time for her to settle with England. England feels her own strength and knows Russia's weakness; and this knowledge, instead of making England drive a hard bargain, will induce her to be lenient so as to reach a fair settlement for the sake of an uninterrupted peace, which is the animating motive of English diplomacy.

An agreement with Russia is the logical outcome of the understanding with France. It is a continuation of the policy inaugurated by Lord Lansdowne when he was secretary of state for foreign affairs, and which was the beginning of that "policy of peace" to which reference has been made in the earlier part of this article. It is well known in diplomatic circles in Europe that negotiations have for some time been pending between Russia and Great Britain concerning Tibet and Persia. If Russia perceives that she can make better use of her energies at home than in satisfying that lust for territory which is almost a mania, and abandons her designs on Persia and Afghanistan, and is willing to embody her renunciation in a formal treaty, there is no doubt England will be only too glad to live on terms of friendship with her. But it is somewhat doubtful whether Russia can be induced to abandon her traditional policy, even for the sake of being on good terms with England.

Spain also has a new Cabinet since I last wrote; Spain, similar to France, having challenged the Vatican. In Spain for some time a feeling has been growing in favor of non-interference of the Catholic Church in civil affairs, especially in the marriage ceremony. A decree of the last Cabinet permitted the civil marriage of Catholics, which the Vatican opposed, and insisted that a marriage of two Catholics was null and void unless it was performed by the ecclesiastical authorities. The Government, however, refused to recognize Rome as superior to civil law, and recognized a civil marriage, while the church refuses to do so. To the surprise and intense chagrin of the Vatican, the young King sided with the anti-Clerical party and sustained the action of his Cabinet. The Clerical press and party at once attacked the King and charged that he was under the influence of his English Protestant bride, although she was received in the Catholic Church before she was wedded. There does not appear to be any foundation for this assertion of the Queen's influence. She has played her part very discreetly. She has declined to be drawn into any religious quarrel, and has made no attempt to interfere in affairs of state.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marshal Lopez Dominguez was at the head of the last Cabinet, which resigned on account of differences as to the lengths to which the anti-Vatican policy was to be pushed. His successor as premier is Señor Moret y Prendergast, who like his predecessor is in favor of terminating the concordat between Spain and the Vatican and putting in effect the same policy that has lately been applied in France. A complete separation of Church and State in Spain is clearly foreshadowed.

The appointment of Perez Caballero as Minister for Foreign Affairs insures a continuance of the arrangement with France, which was agreed upon at the Algeciras Conference, to preserve order in Morocco. Señor Caballero was one of the Spanish delegates to the Algeciras Conference, and the arrangement reached was made with his approval Acting as the mandatory of the Powers, already France and Spain have been called upon to send their forces to Morocco to protect the lives and property of Europeans, and it is not at all improbable that they will have a good deal of work on their hands before the bandits who have so openly defied the authority of the Sultan have been reduced to subjection. The interior of the country affords much better fighting ground for the natives than it does for Europeans.

For the first time in the history of the relations between the United States and Turkey, there is now an American ambassador at Constantinople. Abdul Hamid, Commander of the Faithful, past master of the art of wily diplomacy, who single handed has played every Power against the other, and usually won, has at last met his match in this Government. Abdul Hamid did not want an American ambassador stationed in Constantinople. A minister may not seek audience with a sovereign unless that sovereign deigns thus to honor him, and all his diplomatic intercourse must be carried on with the Minister for Foreign Affairs. An ambassador, on the other hand, may claim the privilege of audience as a right, and the sovereign can only refuse it at the risk of breaking off diplomatic intercourse, with all the risk that that involves.

When Mr. Leishman, the then American minister to Turkey, went to the Minister for Foreign Affairs to make a complaint he was most politely received and sent to another official, who was even more polite and suggested that he go elsewhere. Thus week after week this farce was continued, and no satisfaction was accorded for the violation of treaty rights. When Mr. Leishman asked an audience of the Sultan he was always ill, frequently on the very verge of dissolution.

The act of Congress creating ambassadors provides that when a foreign government accredits an ambassador to this country the United States shall be represented in that country by an envoy of similar rank.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was gently intimated to the Sultan that he should raise the rank of his mission to this country to comport with his own dignity. The Commander of the Faithful received the suggestion, filtered through remote channels, in good part, but unfortunately he was too poor to afford the luxury of an ambassador. For a time at least he must so far dishonor himself as to get along in Washington with an agent so unworthy as a minister.

When Abdul Hamid refused to appoint an ambassador, we took the bull by the horns, and Congress authorized the appointment of an American ambassador to Turkey. Mr. Leishman was duly commissioned, but he was still forced to exercise the gift of patience. The Sultan remained ill, and although Mr. Leishman's presentation was arranged for repeatedly, whenever the day arrived the Sultan was just a trifle worse. Mr. Leishman protested and threatened to close up his embassy and leave Constantinople, which would not have caused Abdul Hamid any great grief. But patience was at last rewarded. One fine day there came a gorgeous state carriage to the American Embassy, and escorted by a troop of cavalry Mr. Leishman drove to Yildiz Kiosk and was received in solemn audience by the Sultan. The Sultan showed no trace of his recent alarming illness. He was only too glad to have the pleasure of receiving the American ambassador. But did he promise to correct the things of which Mr. Leishman complained? Probably not, because it is the Sultan's little way of saying much and doing nothing. Abdul Hamid has not played the game for thirty years without learning something about it.

Sir Edward Grey, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, has put himself in the front rank among the great foreign ministers of Great Britain by securing the consent of the Powers to a compact guaranteeing the inviolability of Norway against territorial aggression and giving to that kingdom an international status similar to that of Switzerland and Belgium. Sir Edward Grey has always been noted for his courage, firmness, and ability to see far in the future; and this compact alone will make his administration notable even if he does nothing else.

Norway as an independent power was always in danger from the ambitious designs of Germany and Russia; Germany with her longing for territorial expansion and her desire to increase her influence on the Continent; Russia forever seeking an ice-free port so that she might become in verity a great naval power. The possession of Norway by either Germany or Russia would be a menace to England; it would give possible enemies a strategic base that would throw an added burden on the British navy. Realizing this, Sir Edward Grey took the initiative to secure

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the consent of the Powers to an agreement respecting the neutrality of Norway.

It was a masterly stroke of diplomacy. It was well understood that Russia was endeavoring to secure a Norwegian port, and had the world stood aloof nothing could have saved Norway from yielding at last to the pressure that was put upon her. To resist Russia by force was out of the question; it was equally hopeless to expect that other nations would support her refusal by force of arms. But the argument used by Sir Edward Grey was sufficient to induce Russia to relinquish her desire to secure a port open the year round; and, with the consent of Russia obtained, Germany was compelled, reluctantly no doubt, also to acquiesce; and Sir Edward Grey knew, of course, that he would meet with no objection from France. Thus what might possibly have caused very grave complications in the near future has been removed. England has safeguarded her own interests and at the same time protected the independence of the newly established Kingdom of Norway, and that "policy of peace" to which the present British Cabinet is committed is given an additional guarantee of its permanence.

A. Maurice Low.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FINANCE.

THE remarkable phenomena of the past three months have been bound up with the credit situation, not only of New York and of America as a whole, but of the world at large. Briefly summed up, it may be said of this situation, as was said a year ago at this time, that the demand on capital seems to have run beyond the immediately available supply. The difference between the present season in 1906 and that in 1905 is a difference of degree, not of kind. The strain has been heavier, the evidences of shortage in supplies greater. Otherwise the course of events this winter has much resembled that of last winter.

In this connection, it may be said that custom has largely removed the strangeness with which the repeated paradox in last winter's markets affected the financial mind. The winter of 1905, to begin with, was the first in at least three years which produced a bank deficit or such extraordinary money rates as twenty-five and fifty per cent; it was the first since 1899 which brought call loans to the 100 per cent figure. This year has repeated and emphasized all of these phenomena. Yet, having already gone through one season marked by such extraordinary financial phenomena, the mind of the people at large began to grow accustomed to them, and, naturally, their appearance excited less of acute alarm than it did in many quarters a year ago. This is both a favorable and an unfavorable incident of the situation. It is favorable, because it prevented any such spread of misgiving as might have jeopardized the situation in general. It is unfavorable, for the obvious reason that, as public concern over what are undoubtedly danger signals in the market begins to subside, to exactly that extent must the danger itself increase.

Perhaps the most striking consideration in the whole matter of undersupply of capital is that which bears on the question of gold production. The increase in the world's gold output during the present year has been constant. Roughly, it may be said that where the whole world's gold output in 1901 was $262,492,900, it had risen to $346,892,200 in 1904, and to $376,289,200 in 1905, and it cannot this year have fallen far short of $400,000,000. Whether these figures are exact or not, the fact remains that the annual gold production has been going on this year at a rate wholly unprecedented in the history of the world. Yet, in the face of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such a showing, not only has the gold in the hands of the New York banks fallen to a lower figure than in any other past few years, but the banks of the outside world make an even more striking showing. The following table gives an idea of the gold holdings of the great European banks at the opening of the present autumn in 1906 and in 1905. For convenience, values are given in pounds sterling:

Gold held by—	1906.	1905.	Increase or Decrease.
Bank of England	£ 35,045,706	£ 35,257,182	−£211,476
Bank of France	115,812,000	118,900,000	−3,088,000
Bank of Germany	32,041,500	34,082,250	−2,040,750
Bank of Sweden	3,879,000	3,636,000	+243,000
Bank of Spain	15,249,000	14,929,000	+320,000
Bank of Russia	81,069,000	91,022,000	−9,953,000
Bank of the Netherlands	5,528,000	6,597,000	−1,069,000
Bank of Belgium	3,948,000	3,693,000	+255,000
Bank of Italy	26,577,000	21,285,000	+5,292,000
Bank of Austro-Hungary	46,791,000	46,328,000	+463,000
Total	£365,940,206	£375,729,432	−£9,789,226

This shows that, in the face of the enormous increase in the past twelve months, these banks held in September something like $49,000,000 less in gold than they held a year ago. It would be apart from our purpose here to go into the details of this seeming disappearance of gold from sight. It is enough to say at this point that enormous amounts of gold have been absorbed into general circulation, through the expanding trade in countries where gold is still a medium of hand-to-hand exchange; also that numerous outside countries, such as Mexico and the Argentine Republic, have been accumulating gold for currency purposes; and, finally, that the amount of gold used in the arts for ornament must have increased very greatly in connection with the general movement of prosperity.

The interesting phase of this movement is that which concerns the absorption both of capital and of gold into the expanding trade of prosperous countries. Some highly interesting particulars of this movement have come to hand from various parts of the world. The immense drain on such supplies by our own interior banks, merchants, and population at large, is familiar to every one. Facts have become known on the European continent, showing the drainage of gold into Westphalia, in connection with the booming iron industry, to have been so great as to have embarrassed the Bank of Germany. In France, it has been credibly stated that Paris money-changers were paying a premium for the small gold currency in the hands of department stores and railway stations. All this naturally works in the same direction, and it all converges

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the winter months when trade is at its height. In addition, during the last few months, there has been a constant accumulation of gold by Russia, where the Imperial Bank has been building up its reserves. Between the issue of its $440,000,000 loan in April and the opening of November, the home gold holdings of the Russian Bank increased nearly $68,000,000.

This demand on money and credit has been merely an incident in and a reflection of the enormous business progress. Production, especially in this country, has been at high notch; and prices have been such that amounts of money, ten, twenty, and sometimes fifty per cent greater than a few years ago, are required to carry and dispose of the same quantities of merchandise. Naturally, the railway industry has been subject to the same demands, and in the case of the railways the strain has come in a double form. Not only are large amounts of money required for the actual moving of the commodities, but the facilities requisite for such traffic must be constantly increased. In fact, at the very high notch of the season's prosperity has come the bitterest imaginable complaint regarding the inadequacy of railway facilities to care properly for the produce in transit. Speaking on this subject before the Merchants' Club of Chicago, no less a railway authority than Mr. James J. Hill made the following remarkable statement in November:

> It has been noticed that from June 30, 1895, to 1905 — ten years — the growth in ton mileage was 110 per cent. The growth in the mileage of railroads to handle that traffic was twenty per cent. There's where you stand to-day — you can see it in that brief comparison. There's where the whole country stands. The traffic of the country is congested beyond imagination. The commerce of the country is paralyzed, which, continued, means slow death.
>
> More cars? Yes, we need more cars, but we need also cars of greater capacity, heavier trains, and more miles of railroad to haul them over. In ten years railroads of the country expanded twenty per cent for the handling of a business that increased 110 per cent. Suppose you are able in the near future to increase that expansion fifty per cent. That will still leave forty per cent a year of the business without any facilities for taking care of it.
>
> It is estimated that from 115,000 to 120,000 miles of track must be built at once to take care of this immense business. But to build that amount will cost as much as the Civil War cost at least. It will cost from $4,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000. A thousand million dollars a year for five years will scarcely suffice. Why, there is not money enough nor rails enough in all the world to do this thing.
>
> And if the rails were piled up ready for the undertaking, and if the money were in bank to-day, it would be impossible to get the labor with which to do it. Labor in the mines, in the forest, in the quarry are behind a stone wall which they cannot scale.
>
> I tell you there is no question since the Civil War of half the consequence of this one.

No doubt, it will be said that Mr. Hill exaggerated the evils of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

case, but his remarks have pertinent bearing on some of the causes operating to increase the strain on capital and to absorb the currency supply of the country. When to such legitimate trade requirements there are added the always urgent demands of speculation, a position is created which may very logically end in such extraordinary money markets as those of the present season. As a matter of fact, this has been preëminently a speculative year. It is true that speculation for the rise in grain and cotton, which largely characterized such years as 1901 and 1903, has cut little figure in the present season. On the other hand, real-estate speculation has risen to a magnitude never reached in this country since the famous boom of the early seventies.

At the approach of autumn, this real-estate craze had reached a stage which gave genuine concern to people who were watching the course of the market. It had gone so far that, in many quarters of the country, speculation was being carried on in "options" on unimproved property — which meant that the right to buy at a given price was based on payment of a constantly rising premium from hand to hand without the title ever changing. Markets, in other words, were dealing in realty "futures." This especially dangerous real-estate speculation was brought to something of a halt by the later movement of the money market; for real estate cannot be bought and utilized without heavy borrowings; and when a merchant pays seven per cent to discount his paper, there is no chance for building loans in the money market, and if builders are forced to suspend operations, buyers of unimproved property begin to take fright.

Therefore, by the middle of October it was possible to say that the Eastern real-estate speculation at all events was checked. When, for reasons which we shall presently see, speculation on the Stock Exchange was also arrested, the public appetite for gambling in values elsewhere still appeared unabated. At precisely this juncture, the so-called "curb market" of New York, following the example already set in Pittsburg, Boston, Chicago, and the Canadian cities, began to bring out mining propositions. Of these it should first be said that plenty of them were legitimate and plenty illegitimate, but that, at the present stage of credit and capital, a sound mining proposition very rarely goes to the curb or into the newspaper columns to obtain the needed funds. On the contrary, its requirements are easily satisfied by private arrangement with wealthy men who make a specialty of such investments. Notwithstanding this fact, the violent rise of certain "curb specialties" among the mining shares seized upon New York in November with such violence as to divert attention almost wholly from Stock Exchange speculation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shares of the Nipissing mine, which had sold at $5 per $5 share early in the autumn, went to $16 at the end of September, and to $34 a month later. With this advance came a violent outburst of speculation for the rise in similar securities. This particular mining stock was sustained in its rise by certain negotiations of genuine mining experts, into the details of which it is unnecessary here to enter. The point to notice is the violence with which speculation followed such an example. At the opening of December, announcement that a hitch in certain negotiations had occurred sent the stock of this mine down within a week from $34 to $12 per share. Yet even this did not wholly discourage the enthusiastic speculators. Summed up, the situation appears to be that the American public has determined to speculate and is using for the purpose all the resources which it can command. This is a formidable addition to the demands of industry on the supply of capital.

Back of all this stood the Stock Exchange market itself, where the extensive speculation of millionaire operators began, as was described in the last number of THE FORUM, at the time of the Union Pacific dividend declaration, and was continued, though with great caution, throughout the season. At times the question was asked, with much bewilderment, whence the resources came to hold these stocks at their existing value, not to mention the advancing of them to a still higher price. This question was greatly emphasized by other incidents of the season to which I shall have occasion to refer. The only sure answer to this question lies in the well-known fact that credit at such times as these will be extended by lenders with little reservation — first because lenders, too, are infected with the speculative ideas, and, secondly, because rising prices seem a guarantee against loss on such investment. As John Stuart Mill remarked, sixty years ago, of a similar episode:

> Not only do all whom the contagion reaches employ their credit much more freely than usual; but they really have more credit, because they seem to be making unusual gains, and because a generally reckless and adventurous feeling prevails which disposes people to give as well as take credit more largely than at other times and give it to persons not entitled to it.

It will be observed that this diagnosis of the position of lenders bears rather curiously on the fact that available supplies of capital should be so unprecedentedly scarce as has lately been indicated by the action of money rates. But this merely goes to show how overwhelming has been the instinct to speculate, and with borrowed money.

It cannot be said that the wild advance on the Stock Exchange, which began in August, has been continued during the past three months.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some stocks have gone considerably higher, and at times there has been a really violent forward movement; but, as a rule, the market has been held back from excesses. There have not been wanting incidents which might have been expected to have provoked excited speculation for the rise and from which in fact such an outcome was predicted. Among these was the remarkable "ore deal" between the Great Northern Railway and the Steel Corporation, which consisted in a lease of the Great Northern ore lands to the Steel Trust on the basis of a royalty of so much per ton for the ore used year by year; the rate rising constantly to a higher figure, and the basic rate being higher than any yet paid by the Steel Corporation. The contract provided an initial price of $1.65 per ton delivered at dock, "with an increase of 3.4 cents per ton each succeeding year"; it stipulated that "the minimum agreed to be mined is 750,000 tons for the year 1907, and increases by 750,000 tons per year until it reaches 8,250,000 tons, and thereafter continues on that basis." The parties to this deal contended that it was highly beneficial to each; the Steel Corporation claiming that through possession of these ore lands their primacy in the steel trade could not possibly be shaken; the Great Northern people naturally looking for valuable stock privileges in connection with the ore lease. In spite of these not unreasonable expectations, the announcement fell on the market almost absolutely flat.

Similarly, as November drew to a close, it was predicted that the publication of the Union Pacific Railway's complete annual statement for the fiscal year 1906 would turn the stock market violently upward. The report was duly published. Its income account, which had previously seen the light, showed a surplus over operating expenses and fixed charges of $31,764,674, as against $22,785,506 in the fiscal year year 1905, and $16,597,093 in 1904.

The new part of the report was that which dealt with the company's assets. In this the remarkable showing was made of $21,258,883 in cash on hand or in bank and of $34,710,000 in demand loans, or a total of nearly $55,000,000 in available cash as against only $7,345,565 shown for the same accounts a year before. It was pointed out that this enormous reserve of cash compared with a similar cash surplus, prior to the Armstrong investigation, of $27,406,000 in the New York Life Insurance Company, $36,643,000 in the Mutual Life, and $45,958,000 in the Equitable. In other words, no one of these institutions, whose enormous cash reserves were believed to have provided the sinews of the great speculation of 1901 and 1902, ever held a sum approaching the mountain of ready cash calmly reported by the Union Pacific.

As to where the Union Pacific obtained this enormous sum, little doubt existed. During the year the company had sold freely part of its hold-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ings of the Northern Pacific and Great Northern stocks obtained by it in return for its Northern Securities holdings at the time that company was liquidated. Originally, it will be recalled, Union Pacific had bought up a majority holding of the $155,000,000 Northern Pacific stock. It had issued bonds to pay for this purchase, and, when the corner of 1901 occurred, had turned in its stock to the Northern Securities merger. When, in the final settlement after the government had upset the merger, Union Pacific lost its control of Northern Pacific, it was in a position to realize on its holdings of liquidated stock; and it did so at the extraordinary prices prevailing during the last two years. This means, in substance, that the company went into debt to buy stocks of a highly speculative nature, that it won in its venture, and turned a portion of its enormous paper profits into cash.

Whether this is safe railway finance, and particularly whether its influence on the community at large is likely to be beneficial, are questions apart from what we are just now considering. So is the further consideration, brought up by many critics when the Union Pacific balance sheet was published, that quite possibly we now had a sight of the private resources on which the inside speculators of the so-called Union Pacific clique were relying for their bold ventures in the market. Of this, no doubt, more will be heard, later on. One conclusion of the season has been that such displays of stupendous wealth by corporations are a sure invitation to Government intervention.

Such a Government attack was begun in November on the Standard Oil as President Roosevelt had intimated in his special message of May 4. In that case the effect on the market for the stock was spectacular. The stock had sold three years ago at $750. At the time of the New York bank deficit of last April it had fallen to $650. The President's message of May sent it to $590, at which price it was quoted up to the middle of last November. The beginning of the Government suit in the middle of November was followed by a break in the stock within a fortnight to 505.

It is unnecessary to infer from the experience of Standard Oil any exactly similar result in any other stock. In fact, the circumstances of Standard Oil are peculiar and are such as could not be easily reproduced with any railway company. But precisely as this collapse of Standard Oil in the middle of November had no effect in demoralizing the general tone of the market, so the extraordinary showing of Union Pacific's assets at precisely the same time had no effect in stimulating speculation. The reason for this anomaly undoubtedly was that the stock market was held firmly by people who did not venture to risk advancing it, but who would not let it go.

For this the obvious reason lay in the money market, where the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rate had repeatedly gone up to the extravagant figures of last autumn, and where, after a brief easing off, time money and commercial paper rose again to the figures accompanying last September's deficit and where the bank deficiencies of April 7 and September 8 were repeated on November 10 — this being the first occasion on which three bank deficits have occurred in a single year at different seasons and with restoration of a surplus intervening. We have now to examine some most extraordinary developments of the season, closely connected both with these shortages in the New York bank reserve and the world-wide strain on credit to which I referred at the opening of this article.

I mentioned in the last number of THE FORUM the unusual attitude of Europe toward our securities, shown in the fact that all the principal markets of England and the Continent placed practically no restrictions on the credit which they professed to be willing to advance to America. This attitude, which was observable to all visitors at the European markets during the summer, has had this autumn certain results which were as logical as they were extraordinary. It was not to be expected that a proffer of credit, to so unlimited an extent, could be made in the face of the speculative appetite of the American market without being utilized to the full.

Ordinarily, such credit facilities are employed through a few powerful and long-established international banking houses. These houses, whose individual credit is, as a rule, beyond criticism, raise very large sums of money abroad on the basis of what is called "finance bills." The term has been used for many years to describe borrowings made purely on credit, and without collateral, for the purpose of obtaining resources from one market to use in another market, during a period of great stress, which is certain eventually to be relieved. For example, in the autumn the demands on the capital of the Eastern markets of America are exceptionally great on account of the harvesting of the crops. In order to pay off the farm hands, transport these enormous crops to market, pay for their storage and transportation, and deliver them to consumers at the seaboard markets, sums are required so great that it would be impossible for an American market providing them to continue to extend the normal facilities to its usual customers.

Now, as it happens, very great portions of these wheat and corn and cotton crops are destined for European markets, which in due course purchase them for their own consumers and pay the bills through remittances of capital to New York. When it is reasonably certain that these crope will reach a given magnitude, the operation on finance bills plays its part. The international banker borrows from London, Paris, or Berlin,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through the exchange market, sums which there is reasonable certainty can be repaid at the time when Europe is settling for exported grain and cotton. The proceeds he loans out in this market, repaying them, later on, with proceeds of the exported produce. Such bills are usually placed for two months, thus bridging the period between the beginning of the extreme harvest demand in America and the beginning of the payment by Europe for its imports of our merchandise. The operation, even on this basis, is somewhat startling to the untrained observer; for it amounts to the raising of sums reaching into the tens of millions purely on the note of hand of a banking house or a group of banking houses. Nevertheless, it is a normal and legitimate factor in international finance, and has operated smoothly and safely during many years.

The singular situation of this summer brought about an immediate change in these finance-bill operations. It did so for two reasons. In the first place, when the offer of credit was made by Europe on so unrestricted a scale, it was inevitable that many financial houses, not entitled by their standing to such facilities as the older international concerns had enjoyed, would rush into the foreign market to provide themselves with funds. They could get them at a lower rate than they would have to pay in Wall street. This is precisely what happened. Loans of this sort were placed on an extensive scale by houses distinctly of the second or third grade, and they were placed, in many cases, without security.

Furthermore, the volume of such loans was not made conditional on the out-turn of the crops; and it must be kept in mind that the banking houses who habitually manage this business had already, on their own score, anticipated this part of the operation. Again, while the older financial houses were accustomed merely to draw on the credits established by their European finance bills, and to lend out the proceeds to legitimate borrowers in Wall Street, it was perfectly well known that these smaller borrowers were raising the money to place it in their own stock speculations. So much for one side of the new situation created at the end of last summer.

Had the attitude of foreign lending banks remained the same as it had been during many years, the applications of these second-grade borrowers would have been rejected. But while the borrowers were multiplying on this side, a sudden and very large accession was made to the ranks of European lenders on "American bills." Precisely as a few Wall Street banking houses had conducted the finance-bill operations between Europe and America in previous years, so the lending of foreign money for such purposes had been mostly in the hands of a few great London and Continental banks. Now, as it happened, not only were all classes of Europe's money-lending community seized last summer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the idea that New York's credit was invulnerable, but the summer came to an end with English trade and speculation sufficiently slack to give only moderate employment to capital in the hands of London banks. The result was that banks which had never before engaged in business of this sort appeared in the market offering money to New York borrowers, and naturally made connections at once with the inferior class of borrowers of whom I have spoken.

Not all of these borrowers were able to secure loans without collateral; but even when security had to be put up, some novel arrangements were made. For instance, loans to an enormous amount were made on the basis of American securities pledged not with the lending banker, but with a New York trust company selected by both borrower and lender as the depository. By this means a situation was created which caused the London "Times," as long ago as the opening of last August, to complain that English borrowers had no longer a fair opportunity, because the capital of London was being "drawn away by a hidden pipe line" to New York.

It should be observed that, although this episode in banking was in most respects as novel as it was startling, it was not wholly new in the experience of the two markets. Had it been so, it is doubtful if the experiment would have been pushed as far as it actually was. At the close of 1900, when the enormous promotions of the ensuing spring were in contemplation, and when the Wall Street banking houses having these operations in charge were well aware that the American market's resources were not sufficient to finance them, some of the older international banking houses, to which I have referred as usually conservative in their methods, borrowed stupendous sums abroad, through their foreign branches, for use in the Wall Street speculation. In large measure the Steel Trust promotion was thus financed with foreign capital; and the Northern Pacific affair was almost entirely carried out through similar resources.

Thus an example had at any rate been set for the exploits of 1906. But of 1901 there are several facts to be recalled which make this year's episode more singular. In the first place, the facilities thus granted to American bankers for the Wall Street speculation of six years ago were cut off almost immediately when it was found what sort of business the money was being used for. A profound sensation was created in the London and Paris banking offices when the Northern Pacific corner coincided with the utterly reckless venture of American millionaires into the "shipping trust" which was to snatch control of its merchant marine from England.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Loans granted by Europe and used in New York for such purposes could not be instantly called back, because by their terms they still had a month or more to run, and because, also, some of them had contained in the contract conditions guaranteeing renewal if desired by the borrower. It is a fact, however, that the great French banking houses at that time shut down absolutely on their New York customers, and that the London banks, under the lead of the Bank of England, virtually called on the borrowing New York bankers for a showing of their books. Furthermore, when the loans did expire, so that it was possible to decide as to their continuance, they were not renewed. This happened, unfortunately for the borrowing American bankers, at a time when the corn crop of the United States had largely failed. It will be remembered that, as a result, we had to export gold in the early autumn of 1901 at the very time when we should normally have been importing it, and that trouble in our market followed.

No attention whatever was paid this year to the precedent of 1901; and there seemed to be a comfortable feeling, on both sides of the ocean, that nothing unpleasant would come of the new experiment, and that the American market would be sucessfully financed through it. The Bank of England recognized, early in the season, that the heavy draughts made on these credits by the American borrowers were so far depressing exchange in favor of New York that gold exports from London must soon follow. But the Transvaal was sending large amounts of gold to London, and the Bank itself made known that, at a pinch, it could spare $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 from its own gold reserves.

Possibly neither of the parties in this operation had looked for the events of September in the New York money market. When the deficit in reserves occurred, September 8, and money went up in Wall Street to the figure of forty per cent, wholly unprecedented for the season, efforts to import London gold in quantity were urgently made by Wall Street bankers. These efforts were assisted by Secretary Shaw, who renewed his offer of lending government money free of interest to importing banks, so as to save the usual loss of interest during transit of the gold and thus to facilitate gold imports.

When it became evident that gold on a large scale could be obtained through this operation, there was rush to get it. At first the London market and the Bank of England filled the demand without protest; but it presently appeared that the extent of the American requirements had been wholly underestimated. Almost within a month the enormous sum of $60,000,000 gold had been engaged by New York on the foreign markets. Our actual imports during September were $30,400,000 and in October $27,000,000, in addition to which gold in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Australia standing to the credit of London houses, and normally designed for London's use, was diverted to New York.

The Bank of England's gold holdings at the close of August amounted to $192,500,000; but by the third week of October they were down to $142,000,000. This was not wholly due to the New York demand; for perhaps the greater part of gold engaged by Wall Street banking houses was taken from the open London market. But, in the first place, these very engagements on the open market headed off, so to speak, gold which would otherwise have gone into the Bank; and in the mean time another striking phenomenon developed in the nature of a hoarding craze in Egypt, where cotton had gone to enormously high prices, and an extravagant speculation had caused exceptional demands on the London market which habitually finances it.

During the month of October, 1905, Egypt took $5,000,000 gold from London, which was about the normal. In the same month of the present year it drew no less than $21,000,000, and most of this came directly from the Bank of England. The Bank of England's ratio of reserves to liabilities, which at the end of August had stood at fifty-one per cent, fell on October 10 to thirty-five and one-half. As is well known, forty per cent is the traditional low mark. It is what Walter Bagehot called the "apprehension minimum." The fixing of so low a ratio as thirty-three and one-half, and at the very time when the normal autumn demands of English trade were just beginning, was recognized as a sign of danger. Long before that figure had been reached the Bank of England began to take precautions. What it did makes up one of the most singular chapters of the financial history of the year.

On September 13, as a matter of regular course, the Bank of England advanced its discount rate from three and one-half to four per cent. Before the advance was made the bank rate was not greatly above the recent average for that time of the year. It stood at three per cent in the first weeks of September last year and the year before. The advance had no influence whatever on the movement of gold to the United States, which, as we have seen, was enormously increased by the low bank reserves at New York, the high money rate, and the Treasury's offer of special facilities — all which occurred just before the London bank rate went up from three and one-half per cent. For some weeks the four-per-cent rate was maintained; then, on October 11, when the bank's gold holdings had fallen $30,000,000 from the figure at which they stood at the first increase in the rate, and when the ratio of reserve had fallen to thirty-five and one-half, as against fifty per cent in the week of the rise to four per cent, the rate was again advanced to five per cent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No more effect seemed to be produced by this than had been produced by the earlier advance. New York continued to draw gold heavily from London, and the operations on finance bills increased at such a rate as to throw the entire London community into a spasm of apprehension. The Bank of England directors for the moment seemed to have lost their heads. Their actions regarding the money market were so vacillating and contradictory that London was unable to discover any concerted policy in what they were doing.

For a time, indeed, they undertook a somewhat remarkable experiment, all things considered, by announcing that they would discriminate against foreign borrowers and in favor of home borrowers, by maintaining the five-per-cent minimum in the case of the foreigners, and lending at easier rates at home. Theoretically, this was sound enough advice, and its purpose was, of course, not to inconvenience British trade by the exaction of an unreasonably high rate. But the only way in which the Bank could effect this discrimination was through lending at the low rate to its own regular customers; and, as it happened, some of its best bank customers were the very banks who were providing the American market with its gold. It did not, therefore, require more than a day or two for the English community to discover that the Bank's experiment was absolutely futile.

This being so, and the movement of gold to New York continuing at an unchecked rate — the Bank lost $6,700,000 gold on foreign account in the first week of October, $9,900,000, in the second week, and $2,300,000 in the third — it was commonly expected in the London market that on October 18, when the weekly meeting of the bank was held, the rate would be advanced to five and one-half per cent or higher. Much to the surprise both of home and foreign observers, the directors took no action at all on this occasion, but left the rate at five per cent. The only explanation of this action was that a moderate reduction in loans had placed the bank in a somewhat stronger position as compared with a week before, so that its ratio of reserve to liability was about two per cent higher than on October 11. The inference commonly drawn from the refusal of the directors to fix a higher rate was that the bank management was satisfied with the situation and believed that it had obtained control of the market.

This was on Thursday, October 18, and the Bank of England is not in the habit of making a change in its rate except at the Thursday meeting. It may, therefore, be judged what was the effect on the financial community, at home and foreign, when on Friday morning, the very next day, a special meeting of the bank directors was held and the announcement given out that the rate had been put up from five to six per cent. Now,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regarding this action, there are several historical facts which deserve to be noticed, because of their direct bearing on this year's episode. In the first place, a six-per-cent official rate at the Bank of England has never been exceeded since the world-wide panic of 1873. More than this, the Bank had fixed that rate only four times in the past twenty-five years, and only ten times in the past forty years.

Furthermore, the occasion for the six-per-cent rate has usually been one when a serious crisis was impending. The last time previous to 1906 when a six-per-cent London bank rate was established was the Boer War panic of November, 1900, when not only were the immense war loans impending, but the Transvaal gold output was shut to Europe's markets. The next previous occasion was the Baring panic of November, 1890, when the failure of the great banking house, with £20,000,000 liabilities, and with entanglements in every market of the world, was impending.

The establishment of the six-per-cent rate was in itself sufficiently disquieting. But the fixing of such a rate at a special meeting, not on the regular weekly day, was calculated to create acute alarm. Such action is most exceptional. A similar step was taken on Monday, October 3, 1899, and on Friday, November 7, 1890, and in each of these instances the advance was made at the irregular occasion because circumstances of a highly critical nature had arisen since the regular meeting day of the bank directors. It was perfectly natural, therefore, that the first inquiry of all financial markets, when they heard the news, should have been: What disaster is impending?

The Bank's directors themselves took pains unofficially to announce that nothing of the sort was in sight; and indeed it soon became evident that this extraordinary action of the directors was taken not because of an apprehended calamity, but because they had been suddenly convinced of the mistake of their previous policy. Some effort was made to show that they had learned, since the Thursday meeting, of the abnormally heavy demand for gold on the part of Egypt; but since the general market had for three or four days been aware that this demand would have to be met, it is hardly conceivable that the Bank's policy was reversed by this fact alone.

Subsequent events have proved abundantly that the Bank had made up its mind to shut the Wall Street borrowers and the Wall Street gold importers absolutely out of the English market, and had determined not to hesitate at any policy, however drastic, which would accomplish that end. During more than a month after the six-per-cent rate was fixed, there was constant talk of an advance to seven per cent in case the New York demand should be renewed; and seven per cent, a rate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which the Bank has not announced since 1873, is distinctly a panicky figure.

In short, the Bank of England had resolved that it must, at all hazards, regain control not only of its own home market, but of the international money market, and turn the flow of gold in its own direction. Among bankers and competent financial critics, there has been much difference of opinion as to the wisdom of this action. Some of the highest practical authorities on the international market have held the ground that the Bank of England directors were seized with a sort of panic, and that the step they took was wholly unnecessary under the circumstances. Others have judged the policy more leniently, though all experienced observers concur in the judgment that the Bank's directors bungled with the problem during the early stages of the American gold movement when they might have accomplished their purposes more promptly without such violent disturbance of the financial situation.

Perhaps the best gauge of practical opinion on the subject lies in the fact that the London commercial community submitted almost without a protest to the higher bank rate. This fact has considerable meaning, for it must be remembered that not only does a six per cent minimum at the Bank of England fix the range for all loans made in its own very large share of the London banking business, but that the loans of all other institutions are necessarily affected by it. With the advance on the London market, there was a general movement of money rates throughout the world to adjust themselves to it.

Neither in America nor in Europe was any one prepared at the time the Bank of England took its startling action to say what the result would be. The one sure result appeared to be that New York would get no more gold from London. But this, as presently was shown, was only part of the Bank of England's purpose. I have mentioned heretofore the fact that several hundred million dollars in American loans were outstanding on Europe's market. As we have seen, the bulk of these, in the form of finance bills or of loans on stocks, were placed in London.

It soon appeared that the Bank of England was not stopping with a move to check the gold withdrawals, but was determined to expel the speculative American borrowers from the London market, and by this means to regulate the rate of exchange between New York and London. This purpose clearly appeared at the so-called Stock Exchange settlement in London one week after the bank rate went to six per cent. It should be said in explanation that where the New York Stock Exchange handles its business by daily settlements, in each of which the account between buyers and sellers is adjusted through payments of bal-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ances and receipt or delivery of securities, such adjustment occurs in London only once a fortnight.

Between the so-called "settlement days" any contract, whether for sale or purchase, entered upon on the London Stock Exchange, is left to be closed out at the ensuing settlement. When that "settlement day" arrives, the purchaser of the stocks who has been carrying them with money borrowed on Lombard Street has the option of extending the account another fortnight. That is to say, he need not pay outright for his securities, but must go to the lenders on the Stock Exchange and procure funds for what is called the "carry-over." The rate demanded at such times depends on several circumstances. Naturally, it is largely regulated by the prevailing rate on the general market; but, in addition, it goes higher or lower as the special account from which the demand arises is large or small. If, for example, a speculation is arranged in South African mining shares, but is slack in English railways, the contango rate, or the charge for continuing the account over the ensuing fortnight, will be higher in the case of mines than of the railways. Manifestly this principle operated on this occasion against such borrowers as were carrying American securities. Applicants for loans upon such security had against them not alone the fact of the higher rate on the outside market, or the fact that the account had long been relatively large, but the further fact that, under the lead of the Bank of England, sentiment in the English banking community was overwhelmingly against the continuance of facilities to such speculative borrowers.

At the London Stock Exchange settlement in the first week of October, the "contango rate" on American securities was six and one-half per cent. At the settlement in the week following the six-per-cent Bank of England rate, the abnormal charge of eight to nine per cent per annum was made for carrying over the account, and this rate was repeated at the two next settlements. Automatically, such a rate would have served to force a transfer of these loans from London to New York; for at the very time when these high rates were charged for loans on American stocks in London, Wall Street banks were lending in New York, on the same collateral, at four and one-half per cent on demand and at six per cent for sixty days. A very large part of the American borrowings in London had taken this form of money-raising at Stock Exchange settlements. Through the Bank of England's opposition, and the high rates at the settlements, enormous amounts of these loans on "Americans" were dislodged.

Now came the real problem of the situation. Every one knew that the great speculation on the New York Stock Exchange, which began

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

late in the summer and which had been sustained in the face of September's forty-per-cent money market, had been financed with London capital. It is impossible to estimate how large a volume of such loans had been transferred from the New York banks to London during September's money stringency. Our bankers' operations in the London gold market had succeeded in drawing upward of $50,000,000 gold from various markets. This enormous sum had been largely used to offset the withdrawal of currency by the West for its harvest demands; and part of it had remained with the banks at New York. As against the $6,577,000 deficit of September 8, the New York surplus reserves had risen on October 13, the week before the London bank rate went to six per cent, as high as $13,024,000. In other words, the New York bank position was reasonably stronger; the surplus at that time being nearly $3,000,000 in excess of the similar date a year ago and only a few millions below that reported in the middle of October during any of the past ten years.

The question which now arose, however, was: If the New York banks should assume these loans sent back from London, in what position would they then be left? On the face of things, there were two alternative possibilities. Having recalled these loans, London naturally would ship back to its New York agents the stocks deposited as collateral. This collateral, arriving in New York, might be used as the basis of further loans in Wall Street, or it might, on the other hand, be immediately sold on the open market, the proceeds being used to discharge the debt. No evidence of such liquidation as would have been required by the second of these alternatives appeared on the New York Stock Exchange. The inference, therefore, apparently remained that the banks were putting up the money for the continuance of the loans, and that their own liabilities would thereby be so far expanded that the surplus reserve would be much more than exhausted.

What followed differed in so extraordinary a degree from the expectations of the banking community as to throw over all the American banking operations of the autumn a veil of mystery. Between Saturday, October 20, in the week when our loans were crowded out of the London market, and November 17, when all of the dislodged securities must have been delivered in New York, loans of the New York Associated Banks had not only not expanded through such addition to their granted credits, but, according to the financial statement, had been decreased by $43,000,000.

An explanation of this financial paradox is difficult to discover; and at this moment it remains a puzzle to conservative observers. Three possible theories have been suggested. The loans might have been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

transferred, as they were last year from the Clearing House banks to the trust companies, whose reports do not appear in the weekly bank returns. Or, in default of this, out-of-town banks might have come into Wall Street, offering such sums in loans as to enable the banks to reduce their own outstanding credits. Or, conceivably, loans might have been raised at other points than on the European continent.

Of these three possibilities, I can only say that no one of them seems in any degree sufficient to explain the disappearance from sight, without any wholesale Stock Exchange liquidation, of some $60,000,000 or $70,000,000 loans; for it must be remembered that the $43,000,000 reduction in the outstanding loans of the New York banks between October 20 and November 17 was not all that is left to be explained. There remain also the $15,000,000 to $25,000,000 in loans transferred from the London Stock Exchange.

A review of the events in financial history and controversy during the past quarter would not be complete without reference to the real progress made in the matter of practical currency reform. I do not mean by this that the steps already taken insure early adoption or even early and thorough consideration of any plan for expanding the bank-note currency. On the whole, it is improbable that in the short session of an expiring Congress much time will be devoted to a subject involving such radical action as this. But what has happened is that an intelligible plan on which the larger representative bankers and commercial bodies are fairly united has come into the field in such a way as to make discussion along harmonious lines entirely practicable. The trouble with currency reform up to this time has been that every organization seemed to have its own plan, and that each of the plans conflicted radically with all the others.

The first step in harmonizing differences this past season was taken by the committee appointed from the Chamber of Commerce of New York City to consider currency reform. This committee submitted its report on October 4. It was adopted by the Chamber, which, as is well known, comprises not only the best known bankers, but the best known business men of New York City. The report thus adopted was peculiar in that it offered two alternative plans, concerning one of which the committee itself plainly expressed its doubts. The first proposition was as follows:

> Let there be created a central bank of issue similar to the Bank of Germany or the Bank of France; such bank to deal exclusively with banks; its stock to be owned in part by banking institutions and in part by the Government; but in its management representatives of the Government shall be supreme. This central bank shall issue currency, rediscount for other banks, hold public money, and act

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as agent of the Government in redeeming its paper money and making its disbursements.

This suggestion called forth virtually no approval among serious critics either in banking circles or in the press. It was conceded on all sides, first, that the traditional prejudice against such a bank of issue, reaching back into Jackson's time, would be overcome, if at all, only with the greatest difficulty and friction, and, in the second place, that no Congress could be imagined which would intrust such powers to a central banking institution at a time when the connection of our largest banks with schemes of speculating millionaires was a matter of notoriety.

The alternative to this central bank-of-issue plan was in substance as follows:

> Let any National bank whose bond-secured circulation equals fifty per cent of its capital have authority to issue additional notes equal in amount to thirty-five per cent of its capital.
>
> Let such additional notes be subject to a graduated tax as follows: The first five per cent taxed at the rate of two per cent per annum; the second five per cent taxed at the rate of three per cent; the third five per cent taxed at the rate of four per cent; then an issue equal to ten per cent of capital taxed five per cent; then an issue equal to ten per cent of capital taxed six per cent.
>
> Let the proceeds of this graduated tax constitute a guaranty fund, in the custody of the Government, for the redemption of the notes of failed banks.
>
> To insure the prompt retirement of notes when not needed, let redemption agencies be established at sub-treasuries and other convenient points.

Shortly after the promulgation of this plan, the committee appointed by the American Bankers Association reported at the annual convention of that body. In brief, the report provided that a currency commission of seven members should be appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate; the commission to be non-partisan; the Comptroller of the Currency to be a member of it, and the term of the other members to expire at variable intervals; that credit currency not secured by bonds and not exceeding fifty per cent of the bond-secured circulation already outstanding against a given bank may be issued by National banks if approved by this commission; that the commission may also determine the length of time during which such currency should remain outstanding; finally, that a tax of one per cent per annum on such credit currency should be exacted.

As between this plan and that of the Chamber of Commerce, the latter was far more generally approved. The scheme of a currency commission, brought forward in the Bankers Association plan, found no great favor, chiefly because of the delay necessarily involved and the easy possibility that such a commission might find itself out of sympathy with one or another section of the country. In the middle of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

November, representatives of both of these committees met at Washington and undertook to harmonize their differences.

The plan, as at length approved, adopted the graduated tax idea, proposing, however, in place of the Chamber of Commerce Committee's slow and regular increase in the rate, a two-and-one-half-per-cent tax on credit issues up to forty per cent of the bond-secured circulation, and a five-per-cent tax on further issues up to twelve and one-half per cent of the capital. The criticism was fairly made that this plan, being less simple and more confusing than the Chamber of Commerce plan, which it replaces, stood at a disadvantage for that reason. It will serve, however, as a basis for further discussion.

One new proposition injected by the harmonizing committee was that the credit-note issues, having no bond collateral back of them, must be sustained by the same cash reserve—twenty-five per cent in the case of city banks and fifteen per cent with country institutions—as is now required to be held against National bank deposits. This proviso met with general approval. Such reserves were in fact required by the National Bank law from its enactment in 1864 until 1874, their abandonment at the latter date having been simply due to the recognition of the fact that, government bonds having greatly appreciated in value, their deposit to guarantee the note circulation was abundant security.

As a step further in dealing with present currency difficulties, the compromise plan set forth November 15 proposed this further innovation, that the present requirements of collateral security against government money deposited in National banks should be dispensed with, and the payment of two per cent interest to the Government be required in place of it. There can be no doubt that the law regulating public deposits urgently needs revision. As it stands, different public officers interpret it differently. Before Secretary Shaw took office, all secretaries had assumed that the law explicitly required deposit of government bonds to secure such public funds. Mr. Shaw, through a technical construction of the act, has admitted certain high-grade securities other than government securities in such collateral.

The Chamber of Commerce plan of 1902, afterward incorporated in a Congressional bill by Senator Aldrich, proposed that two per cent interest be required against public deposits, but that certain municipal and railway securities should be acceptable as collateral.

At the time, this proposition fell flat in Congress because of the opposition not by an anti-bank element, but by the Western bankers themselves, who objected to paying interest on deposits which they had hitherto been holding free of interest. Precisely how the proposal of last November will be received by this same element is an interesting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question. The criticism is bound to be made both on this proposition and on the general plan for a credit currency unsecured save by the general assets of the bank, that these prior liens by the note holders and the Government are placing the ordinary depositor in a somewhat different position from what he has heretofore occupied.

In all probability the success of this plan, with or without modification, depends on the movement of events in the money market and the government-bond market. If the requirement for a circulating medium continues to increase at its recent extraordinary rate, and the supply of government bonds does not increase, the demand for some new form of banknote issues may become irresistible. On the other hand, there is at least the chance of reaction in the demands of trade, and, again, the Panama Canal renders certain a large and early increase of outstanding government securities.

What, in view of the conditions and events which we have now reviewed, is to be said of the outlook for American finance? In Wall Street one meets, and has met during the past three or four months, the very general answer that, with the arrival of January and the relaxing of the money strain, everything will be comfortable again and matters financial will go on under normal pressure. The experience of January, 1906, is forcibly invoked as witness to this probability.

And, in fact, there are two concessions freely made, even by people who have shown real concern over the high money rates and the weak bank position of this season. One is that, although money stringency is likely to continue longer into the new year than it did twelve months ago, nevertheless the acute strain should relax. The other concession is that our prosperity is so real, our tangible wealth so enormous, and the impetus of a series of prosperous years so great, that no serious reverse to our commercial prosperity is to be logically looked for.

That the country has indulged in many excesses is admitted; more grudgingly, it is admitted that such speculative extravagances as have marked the past few years must in the end bring their own penalty. What people usually rest upon, when in a speculative frame of mind, is the assurance that they are safe for some little time to come. No one will doubt the propriety of such assurances in the case of financial America.

The graver consideration concerns the longer future, and arises from the fact, of which we have seen so abundant evidence, that credit is being rashly employed, that the precautions of normal years, in banking affairs particularly, are being one after another relaxed, and, in particular, that at the very time when the automatic warnings of the money

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

market are most sharply sounded, the feeling grows more and more general in the financial community itself that we need no longer heed them.

This is the danger of the future, exactly as it was in 1871 and 1872 — when, as in the present year, Wall Street paid exorbitant money rates, declaring that it could readily afford to pay them and that it was not at all alarmed at such warnings of overstrained credit. The situation, looked on from this consideration, has been fairly summed up in President Roosevelt's message to Congress on December 4, which began as follows:

> As a nation we still continue to enjoy a literally unprecedented prosperity; and it is probable that only reckless speculation and disregard of legitimate business methods on the part of the business world can materially mar this prosperity.

This statement is certainly reassuring; but it perhaps becomes less so when one reflects that reckless speculation is already in progress on an extraordinary scale, and that, in more than one financial quarter, disregard of legitimate business methods has become almost habitual.

ALEXANDER D. NOYES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

APPLIED SCIENCE.

Among the many questions of interest attracting the attention of the engineer during the past few months, we note especially the consideration given to fuel and combustion problems. Men are beginning to realize that the manufacture of power by the combustion of fuel, itself a wasteful operation, is generally conducted in a more wasteful manner than is really necessary. Furthermore, we have been giving insufficient attention to the cheaper and lower grades of fuel, notwithstanding the fact that such combustibles, in many cases, are really as efficient, in proportion to their cost, as the higher qualities.

Much of this interest, in the United States at least, has been stimulated by the valuable researches of the Geological Survey, begun in connection with the St. Louis Exposition, and continued since that time, as already noted in these reviews. To this work is now added the independent series of tests undertaken by the Geological Survey of Illinois in conjunction with the Engineering Experiment Station of the University of Illinois, while in other parts of the world investigations are being conducted upon the fuel values of peat, lignites, and other low-grade fuels.

The fact is that fuel costs are entering more than ever into the larger problems of industry and manufactures, while at the same time engineers and manufacturers are watching those costs more closely than formerly. When to the investigation of the actual cost of power produced from black coal there comes in many places the competition with power generated from the white coal, the hydraulic power from the snow-capped mountains, the reasons for the study of fuels become apparent.

Experiments upon fine coal, commonly known as screenings, show some interesting relations between the size, the proportion of ash, and the steaming value; and as such screenings constitute one of the cheaper grades of steam coal, reliable information about the fuel value is of direct commercial importance. Coal containing much ash may be purchased at a low price; but the loss due to the presence of ash is greater than the direct proportion of ash present, since it interferes with the combustion of the coal to a greater extent than might have been supposed. Investigations have also shown that the best results are obtained

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with coal screened through a sieve having openings about three-quarters of an inch square, the efficiency falling off for larger or for smaller sizes. These are but instances of the practical value of scientific experiments upon the behavior of fuel, apart from any study which may be made upon the comparative efficiency of coals from various localities.

In connection with any study of the cost of power, the engineer must consider not only the actual efficiency of the particular engine to be used, but also the local cost of the fuel which is available in that locality. It matters little that a particular type of internal-combustion engine, using liquid fuel, has a very high thermal efficiency, converting a large percentage of the heat into work, if the money cost of the liquid fuel is high in the place where the motor is to be used.

An oil engine might be a most economical prime mover in Southern Russia, for instance, and less economical than a steam engine in England. Comparative statements of the cost of power from gas, steam, oil, or water are now no longer considered of general application, but demand, for their intelligent use, the proper additional information as to fuel costs, transport charges, and other data concerning the locality of use. In this, as in other departments of work, the engineer is learning to act as an economist to the material advantage of his clients and the broadening of the scope of his work.

Another department of work in which the engineer must exercise the ability of the economist and the financier as well as of the constructor is in the planning and building of electric and interurban railways. The engineer himself must consider not only the problems of power plant, road-bed, and equipment, but also the wider questions of available traffic, both present and potential, in the territory. He must decide how extensive an equipment the immediate business will demand, and estimate, with safe judgment, how the requirements for future growth can be met.

Upon the application of scientific methods to just such questions, the commercial success of an enterprise will often depend. Formerly the business man attempted to determine these points himself, sometimes with the aid of scientific advisers, more frequently with his own unaided judgment. To-day the engineer does all this and often more, and his application of the precise methods of scientific research have established their superiority in many instances.

An important problem in the great domain of transportation at the present time appears in the matter of providing a sufficient supply of cars for the demands of business. Both in the United States and in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe there appears an insufficiency of transport vehicles, with the consequent delays in the transportation of merchandise. At the same time, it appears that the number of cars in existence would be ample for the entire demands of the traffic if it were only possible to restrict their use to the legitimate purposes of transport. Many cars are now withdrawn from transport service for temporary warehousing. That is to say, the cars are not unloaded promptly upon delivery at their destination, but are held upon sidings or other tracks for days at a time until the merchandise can be conveniently unloaded.

Railway managers have endeavored to overcome this evil for a long time, but without effect; but there is every reason to believe that some definite action will be taken at an early day to put a stop to a practice which is so injurious to the prompt movement of merchandise upon the railroads. The Interstate Commerce Commission is insisting that all shippers shall be treated alike, so far as the time allowance for the removal of goods from the railroad's possession is concerned, while the railroads themselves are considering the imposition of higher demurrage charges in order to render the use of their cars as storage warehouses too expensive to be long continued.

In this, as in other situations apparently of a commercial nature, the engineer steps in by providing improved appliances for the more rapid loading and unloading of the cars. Iron ore, coal, or similar merchandise is either dropped through the bottom of the car, or, in the more recent devices, the entire car is held in a suitable frame and turned bodily upside down, returned to position, and passed on in less time than it takes to describe the operation. In loading cars from the holds of vessels the improved grab buckets remove tons at a load and deposit them at the will of the operator. At the iron furnace or in the steel mill the lifting magnet is now available, so that material formerly difficult to handle may be picked up, transferred, and deposited with freedom and precision.

By these and similar methods, the time required for the actual handling of material in the course of transport has been reduced to a minimum, and, so far as the engineer is concerned, there is no reason why cars should be detained or delayed at the terminus. The question of unshackling railroad commerce by releasing the cars now held for warehousing purposes must be solved by the business department of the railway systems. The engineer has done his part already, and done it very well. The importance of maintaining the railways of a country at their full efficiency by enabling all the cars to be used for their legitimate service of transportation will be realized when the close relation of the railroads to the general industrial progress of the nation is considered.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is especially true in the United States, where the great distances have required the development of correspondingly great transportation systems.

In the older countries of Europe, and notably in Great Britain, the moderate distances enabled the natural resources of the country, and especially the mineral wealth, to be developed with the more primitive means of transport available before the era of railways. In America, the active manufacturing and mining industries were compelled to remain near the Atlantic seaboard; but it has been the modern railroad which has permitted the tremendous expansion in the iron industry. To-day iron ore is hauled 700 to 1,000 miles to meet the fuel supply, and the finished product is then distributed over the entire country. In like manner the transport of coal has rendered possible the development of local manufacturing industries in the interior of the country, where formerly agricultural pursuits predominated.

Copper, silver, gold, and the mineral industries in general owe their accelerating rate of growth to the incentive of adequate railroad facilities, a growth which must increase for a time at least, and then become modified as the present resources become exhausted and new materials and methods replace the old.

Before the railroads grew to their present dimensions, the artificial waterway, the canal, and the canalized river offered the most efficient means of transport for merchandise, and the canal is yet able to hold its own where cheapness is a paramount consideration. In many parts of the world there is a revival of interest in canal construction and operation, and in Central Europe especially is this the case.

There has long been a tendency toward the adoption of some mechanical system of canal traction to replace the primitive method of towage by animal power; but in nearly every instance the additional cost of the mechanical traction has led to its abandonment, even when the mechanical performance has been satisfactory. The latest experiences, however, in using electric traction, appear to have given encouragement both as to mechanical and commercial efficiency, and the reports from Germany are attracting interested attention.

These experiments have been made upon the Teltow Canal, a portion of the great system of internal waterways in Germany intended to unite the navigation of the Oder and the Elbe. The towing system adopted is that of using an electric locomotive, running on a narrow-gauge track laid upon the tow-path, the locomotive taking its current supply from an overhead wire, and drawing several barges in the canal by means of a tow-rope connection. The apparatus contains a number

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of ingenious details, the object being to perform every function by electric power, in the control of the operator on the locomotive.

Thus, there is one traction motor, driving the machine along upon the tracks, another motor for raising or lowering the mast to which the tow-rope is attached, and a third motor geared to a drum on the locomotive. This latter apparatus enables the tow-rope to be wound up or let out at will, so that the engine may run ahead at a lock or similar location, and then wind up the rope and draw the boats ahead while the locomotive is standing still. The drum is also provided with a friction connection which will slip if any sudden resistance is encountered. There are two lake sections in the canal, and in these electric tow-boats are used, these taking current from overhead conductors, supplemented by storage batteries.

Experience with this installation shows that with a heavy traffic, using every economy in the operation of the generating station, electric traction may be able to compete, with other methods. For an annual traffic of 2,000,000 tons, the costs of electricity and steam are about the same, while for 4,000,000 tons there is an advantage of about twenty per cent in favor of the electric service. In any case it is essential that the operation be limited to a single kind of service, since any attempt to operate a mixed system of mechanical and animal traction materially increases the cost.

Now that the bill liberating alcohol from excessive taxation has become a law, there is being given increasing attention to the modifications desirable in internal-combustion motors to enable them to use this fuel to advantage. It is well understood that a higher compression of the charge of air and fuel in the engine cylinder is desirable for alcohol than for gasoline; but this is a matter easily controlled by adjusting the proportion of the clearance space to the cylinder volume. A matter not so easily arranged is the production of the vapor of alcohol, since this fuel is not so volatile as gasoline, and the ordinary carburetter is unsuited to the duty.

In most of the designs proposed, the plan is to heat the carburetter, utilizing for this purpose the warmth of the exhaust gases, a plan which does very well after the engine is in full action, but which is not so convenient in starting, since some external source of heat is then necessary until the carburetter is warmed up.

An ingenious method has recently been suggested by Dr. Schreber, that of injecting the liquid alcohol directly into the cylinder during the compression stroke, the heat developed by the compression causing the vaporization of the alcohol, and the compressed mixture being ignited

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

electrically at the beginning of the power stroke, as usual. This method obviates any necessity for a carburetter, while the heat absorbed in vaporizing the alcohol enables a higher degree of compression to be used than would otherwise be possible, without danger of premature ignition of the charge. This is but one of the methods by which alcohol may be used effectively in internal-combustion engines, and there is no doubt that this fuel will come into very general use for automobiles and motor boats, as well as for stationary engines.

With the development of electric traction for interurban and local service, there has arisen an effort on the part of existing steam railroads to meet the competition with their local traffic. The ordinary railway train cannot meet the requirements for a frequent local service in competition with its electric rival, nor can the steam road be converted into an electric railway at once, or at all, if its merchandise traffic will not permit. Under these circumstances, the railroads are turning to the various designs of self-contained motor cars, operating upon the existing tracks, and equipped with their own propelling machinery. Such cars, being independent of the regular locomotives, may be run at any time when the tracks are clear, and it is practicable to meet the demand for a frequent local service in this way very effectively.

The question of cost is naturally the controlling one, and this has led to some investigations, especially in England and on the Continent, as to the relative costs of operating different types of railway motor cars. Such cars have been made with internal-combustion motors, similar to the engines used for automatic service; but the demand for gasoline renders it improbable that this source of motive power is likely to be generally employed for local railway traction. It is possible that alcohol motors may be developed to a point where they will be available for this purpose, but such machines have not yet been introduced.

At the present time, the railways must choose between steam and electricity. The steam motor car, the car carrying its own boiler and engine, and possibly hauling a single trailer, has been found to be an economical and convenient machine; and in actual service such cars, carrying about sixty passengers, can be operated at a cost of about fifteen cents per mile. Electrical propulsion is distinctly more costly, being about three times as great as for steam, using the third-rail system or secondary batteries.

Apart from the actual cost of operation, however, the independent motor cars for passengers are found to possess many advantages. The small size of the unit enables a frequent service to be given at a mileage cost of about one-third that of the ordinary passenger train-mile. Local

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stops, accompanied by good speeds and rapid accelerations, permit of a service which is satisfactory to passengers, keeping the road cleared for the through trains. Special trains, usually expensive and inconvenient, are readily replaced by the handy motor car; and one or more of such cars may be kept ready for immediate call at any great terminal, with little cost or trouble. That these advantages are appreciated by the railway companies of Europe is evident from the increasing number of such machines in service; and both in Europe and in the United States they may give material aid in solving the problem of effective competition with the local and interurban electric lines.

An interesting development in machine-shop practice appears in the manner in which a number of shop operations are becoming standardized, or reduced to matters of record and repetition, with material benefit both to the manufacturer and the user of the product. The late Sir Joseph Whitworth, a pioneer in this matter, used to say that his attention was directed to the subject by observing the lack of agreement in the diameters of candles and the sockets of candlesticks. Whitworth standardized British screw threads, and introduced standard gauges for cylindrical and other pieces; and others have carried the work on since his death.

In England, the Engineering Standards Committee, a body operating for various government departments in connection with the national engineering societies, has issued some very valuable reports. Among the reports already issued may be mentioned those for rails and for structural shapes, also for screw threads for bolts and for pipes and for other machine elements for which uniformity and interchangeability are desirable.

Apart from the devising of standards, the committee has recently done some excellent work in gathering and classifying certain workshop data, covering the tolerance of error and the allowances in fitting practised by the leading establishments. It has been fully accepted in the best workshops that various kinds of work involve definite limits of tolerance or permissible error; but the practice of prominent shops has varied, and the work of the committee has enabled these various allowances to be compared, analyzed, and standardized for the benefit of others. These methods have also been applied to the standardization of running, sliding, and forcing fits, as they are called, giving the difference in size between the hole and the piece to go into it, according as the parts are to move freely or to be closely and firmly fitted together.

It is important in all such standardizing work that the methods should be sufficiently elastic to prevent the perpetuation of forms or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

processes which ought to become obsolete. There is sometimes danger that the adoption of fixed standards may result in impeding improvements and delaying the development of inventions; but such need not be the case if the governing body exercises proper judgment, and especially if it be so constituted as to be of continuing existence, so that it may be able to provide for future improvements.

The British Engineering Standards Committee, working as it does in connection with the National Physical Laboratory, with the Institution of Civil Engineers, and with other high organizations, forms a body of just such judicial and reviewing powers as make for the permanence of the essentials as well as the development of those details which are absolutely necessary for success.

The advantages of standardization are beginning to be realized in many departments of work, a notable example being that of the design and construction of automobiles. At the earlier exhibitions there were shown almost as many different methods of construction and proportion as there were exhibitors, while at the last show held in New York one of the notable features was the extent to which structural differences had been eliminated. The various machines still show the differences in style necessarily involved in their independent production, but in their mechanical features the influence of standardization is plainly apparent to the distinct benefit of both manufacturer and purchaser. The same is true of other manufactured products, and there is little doubt that much of the progress which has been made in machine design during the past decade is due to the acceptance of scientific methods of standardization by a large number of leading manufacturers.

Some time ago I referred in these reviews to the fact that a number of investigators were experimenting with a view to improving the efficiency of the incandescent electric lamp, and this work is being continued with unremitting energy in different parts of the world. For many years the incandescent lamp has remained practically as if it were accepted as a finality, a sort of staple article, not susceptible of further change. The carbon loop in its exhausted bulb has become a sort of household article not widely removed from the former status of the "fish-tail" gas-burner; and electrical engineers appeared to be devoting more of their efforts to the proper production of the electric current than to its more effective application, at least so far as lighting was concerned.

Some of the earliest experiments in incandescent lighting were made with metallic filaments; but the lack of durability together with other imperfections led to the abandonment of metals and the adoption of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carbon. It has now practically been demonstrated that many of these early difficulties were due to impurities in the metal filaments, and with the improved methods for producing fine wires, of a high degree of purity, of the more infusible metals, a wide field for investigation has been opened.

The use of filaments of tantalum and of osmium has been already noted in these pages, and now we have the rare metal tungsten as a candidate for favor. Tungsten, although rare in the pure metallic state, is well known and widely used in combination, especially in connection with the production of special alloy steels. Indeed, it has been employed in this connection for many centuries, since the so-called "wootz," the famous steel of India, is known to owe some of its peculiar properties to the presence of tungsten.

The very high melting point of tungsten has led it to be used experimentally for a lamp filament; the method of substitution, devised by the German chemists Just and Hanamann, enabling the element to be produced in a metallic state. This method of substitution is an interesting example of the manner in which an operation, originally little more than a curious laboratory experiment, may become a valuable commercial process in an important department of applied science.

The method consists in the heating of a filament of carbon in an atmosphere consisting of a gaseous compound of some other metal. As originally tried, the result was a coating of the metal, deposited upon a core of carbon. Under certain conditions, however, it has been found possible to cause the carbon filament to be oxidized as the metal is deposited, so that ultimately a pure metallic filament replaces entirely the original filament of carbon.

It is in this manner that filaments of pure molybdenum and of osmium have been produced, and more recently the same process has been successfully applied to make filaments of pure metallic tungsten. Filaments of this kind when used in exhausted bulbs, similar to the ordinary carbon-filament incandescent lamp, enable a brilliant light to be obtained with a much lower consumption of electrical energy than is required for the carbon lamp, the current consumption being but one-half to one-third that of the older type, while the life of the lamp is lengthened nearly fifty per cent. There have thus been obtained excellent results with incandescent lamps using tantalum, osmium, and tungsten in the place of carbon; and although the carbon-filament lamp will doubtless long continue to be used, the new lamps will also be developed as important rivals

In the last of these reviews I referred to the completion of the new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British battle-ship "Dreadnought," and some of the most notable peculiarities of design and equipment involved in this latest naval fighting machine. In the mean time the speed trials of the vessel have been completed, and, in view of the fact that this is the first example of the propulsion of a first-class battle-ship by steam turbines, especial interest is attached to the results. The vessel was designed for a speed of 21 knots at a displacement of 18,000 tons, with a development of 23,000 horse-power.

As a matter of fact, the exertion of 23,000 horse-power produced a speed of 21.25 knots, an important gain over the original estimate, while it was found possible to attain a maximum power of 27,518 horse-power, this giving a speed of 21.6 knots. This really means that a first-class battle-ship, heavily armored, and with maximum gun power, has also the speed of a swift cruiser, a combination hitherto considered unattainable. It is realized that such a speed loses much of its tactical advantage unless the other units of the fleet of which the vessel forms a part are equally speedy, since the speed of the slowest vessel measures the practical rate of progress of the whole. It is planned, however, to complete the scheme by providing three similar battle-ships as promptly as may be, and thus enable the full benefit of this high speed to be rendered of practical utility.

An interesting point in the speed trials of the "Dreadnought" appears in the method used to measure the power developed by the turbine engines. As is well known, the usual method of measuring the power of a steam engine is by means of the indicator, this being a form of recording pressure gauge which makes a diagram showing the actual steam pressure in the engine cylinder at each point in the stroke. From this diagram the average pressure acting to impel the engine is found, and, combining this with the dimensions of the cylinder and the speed of the engine, the power developed may be computed.

In the case of the steam turbine, however, the indicator cannot be applied, since the steam flows continuously through the machine, acting upon a varying area of rapidly revolving vanes in its flow. The method devised for the turbine engine is based upon the measurement of the torsion or twist of the propeller shaft itself, this twisting spring of the shaft naturally being greater or less as the power transmitted varies.

The apparatus involves some very ingenious electrical appliances, the measurement of the distortion of the shaft being determined by the difference in electrical contacts on two discs placed at a definite distance apart on the shaft. When the apparatus is once installed, the shaft itself becomes a continual transmission dynamometer, so that the power passing through it may be read off at any moment. In this manner a series

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of progressive speed trials were made, and the power required for successive speeds readily determined.

In connection with improvements in the design and control of vessels, mention may here be made of the proposal of Herr Otto Schlick, the well-known German marine engineer, to minimize the rolling of ships by the use of the gyroscopic action of revolving bodies. Every one is familiar with the scientific toy known as the gyroscope, consisting of a small disc with a heavy rim, arranged in a pivoted frame so that it may be rotated at a high speed. Such a wheel possesses the property, when in rotation, of resisting any effort tending to displace it from the plane in which it is revolving.

This action may be very forcibly demonstrated by taking the rear wheel of a bicycle from the machine and holding the axle in the hands while the wheel itself is rotated. It will be found that any attempt to twist the wheel into a different position will encounter a very considerable resistance, this resistance depending upon the weight of the rim of the wheel and upon the speed of its rotation. If the tire be removed from the bicycle wheel, and the rim wound with a number of coils of wire or, better still, with a few turns of lead pipe, the effect of a heavy rim upon this gyroscopic action will be most apparent.

Herr Schlick proposes to utilize this action by mounting a heavy wheel amidships on strong trunnions, and maintaining it in rotation by means of an electric motor. In order to avoid opposing too positive a resistance to the forces causing the rolling, it is suggested to arrange some form of retarder, such as a friction brake or hydraulic buffer, between the wheel suspension and the hull of the vessel, and thus prevent the jarring action which might otherwise occur. It is altogether possible to compute the forces producing rolling in a ship of given dimensions and proportions, and this has been done for several examples; and it is found that a wheel four metres in diameter and ten tons weight may be so placed and run as to neutralize completely the rolling action of a ship of 6,000 tons displacement.

It does not follow that the prevention of rolling will cause the disappearance of seasickness, although it is possible that the malady may be modified by the steadying of the ship. Experience has shown that the vertical movement alone is sufficient to cause nausea in many persons, just as a similar effect is produced in a rapidly descending elevator car, so that the improved device may not prove the boon so much desired. It should aid, however, in providing a steadier gun platform for war-ships, and other applications will doubtless suggest themselves.

The question of fire prevention is attracting increasing attention from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

engineers, both in connection with the construction of fireproof buildings and with scientific methods of preventing the occurrence and spread of fires.

A not infrequent cause of fires is believed to be the so-called spontaneous ignition of bituminous coal when stored in bulk, either in the yard or in the bunkers of a vessel. This danger is especially serious on shipboard, and since many coaling stations distant from their source of supply must be served by colliers making long voyages in tropical climates, the question of protection against loss of life and property in such cases becomes most important.

Coal requires a temperature of about five hundred degrees Centigrade for its ignition, and unless such a temperature is attained no danger is to be feared. It is difficult to see how so high a heat can be caused by any chemical action in the coal itself; but it appears to be amply proved that the combined action of the internal accumulation of heat and some external source of heat together may produce ignition, flame, and disaster. Bituminous coal will become heated through the absorption of oxygen, and although this action is slow it often occurs in the interior of a mass of coal, where there is no opportunity for the heat to escape, and where consequently its accumulation will cause a steady rise in temperature to take place.

Ventilation is generally recommended as a remedy, and if the whole body of coal could be thoroughly ventilated it might be kept safely cool; but this is usually impracticable. Extinguishing fires in the heart of a mass of coal by applying water is also difficult, since water gas is often generated by the contact of the vapor with the incandescent carbon, and dangerous explosions may follow.

An ingenious method of preventing such fires has been suggested by Prof. Vivian B. Lewes, this depending upon the action of carbon dioxide, commonly known as carbonic acid gas. This gas is most effective in the extinction of fire, most of the so-called chemical fire extinguishers depending upon its generation for their action.

Prof. Lewes, however, goes a step further, and proposes to place a number of cylinders containing liquefied carbon dioxide in the midst of a cargo of coal, these flasks being provided with fusible metal stoppers which will melt and allow the escape of the liquid if the temperature of the coal becomes too high. The escaping liquid produces an intense degree of cold in its evaporation, this action lowering the temperature in the vicinity at once, while the gas itself permeates the coal from within outward, effectually extinguishing any fire which it may meet. Since liquefied carbon dioxide is now an ordinary article of commerce, there appears to be no good reason why this plan may not be carried out suc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cessfully and at small cost. The cylinders of liquid gas may, of course, be used repeatedly until they are discharged.

Among the great engineering works planned and to be executed as a part of the development of New York city, mention should be made of the scheme for the provision of the future water supply of the metropolis from the Catskill region. This plan involves the construction of twelve reservoirs in various parts of the district, an aqueduct sixty miles in length, a tunnel under the Hudson River, and an expenditure of more than $160,000,000, a larger sum than that estimated necessary for the construction of the Panama Canal. The plans assume the provision of more than 500,000,000 gallons of water per day, this being in addition to the present Croton supply of 300,000,000 gallons daily, the proposed new aqueduct delivering the water from the Catskills to the edge of the Croton water-shed.

Although the surveys have been completed and much of the preliminary work laid out, the undertaking is so extensive that its completion is a long way off, and probably the supply will be greatly needed even before it is available. It is significant, however, that the engineering works involved in the growth of a great city are as great, both in cost and importance, as the national and international undertakings about which much more is said and concerning which non-technical readers may be led to form opinions altogether disproportionate to their relative importance.

During the past few months the interest in aëronautics has been increasing, and some very interesting experiments have been made. I mentioned in the last review the fact that M. Santos-Dumont had turned his attention from the dirigible balloon to the aëroplane, and since that time he has made several successful flights. His machine consists essentially of a combination of several box kites of the Hargrave type, the general form being that of the letter T, the apparatus being supported, while on the ground, upon light bicycle wheels, permitting a forward movement until the speed becomes sufficiently great to cause the apparatus to ride up on the air like a kite.

Experience has demonstrated that there are two essentials which must be provided for before the aëroplane can become a practical success. The first of these is a motor of such light weight that it shall not be an excessive burden upon the supporting power of the aëroplane surfaces. The second point is one rather of design and operation than of actual construction — the command of equilibrium.

When it is remembered how difficult the beginner finds it to balance himself in his first attempts to ride on a bicycle, it may, perhaps, be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

realized how necessary some knowledge of balancing the machine is to the experimenter with an aëroplane. M. Levasseur has supplied M. Santos-Dumont with a motor of twenty-four horse-power which weighs only a little more than sixty-three pounds, while M. Santos-Dumont himself has apparently mastered the art of balancing his new machine, since he has made public flights of nearly 700 feet, and appears to have the mechanism fairly well in his control.

These experiments have drawn renewed attention to the work of the Wright brothers, whose successful experiences in gliding flight are well known. It is claimed that the Wrights have succeeded in applying a motor to their aëroplane, and that they have made controlled flights of several miles with their latest machine. It is certain that M. Fordyce, who visited the Wright brothers, on behalf of the French Government, more than a year ago, was favorably impressed with their work; and even before the present reports of successful flights were made public, it had become evident to those who followed their experiments that these indefatigable young men had made great progress in the difficult art of balancing.

There seems to be little doubt that the practical solution of the problem of the aëroplane is near at hand; and like many other such questions, it will be solved not by some startling invention, but rather by the gradual development of the essential elements involved, through the growth of the art of mechanical construction in response to the demands of the engineer.

HENRY HARRISON SUPLEE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDUCATIONAL OUTLOOK.

Good teachers are getting scarce. Cities which exact a high standard of qualification find their eligible lists depleted and no immediate supply in sight. This state of things is in a measure accounted for by the prevailing shabbiness in the remuneration of teachers. The rewards are not such as to induce enough ambitious young men to invest their time and strength in a thorough preparatory course. The increase of money-earning opportunities for working women has still further reduced the influx of desirable material. The situation is a serious one. Thousands of efficient teachers leave school work every year for more remunerative labor. They feel that they cannot afford the luxury of teaching. Meanwhile the number of inefficient ones must of necessity increase, and as a matter of fact is increasing, their inefficiency ranging all the way from lack of professional judgment down to rank illiteracy. People devoid of almost everything included under the term culture, a considerable percentage of them possessing not even a modicum of elementary instruction, manage to get employment as teachers.

Frederick the Second of Prussia has been held up to scorn because he insisted that his non-commissioned officers, many of them confirmed drunkards, wanting employment, should be appointed as school teachers. All protests were met by the explanations that they must have shelter during the inclement winter days; that teaching would keep them out of mischief; that being military drill-masters they would keep the children in order; and that the wages paid to teachers were all they were worth. The frugal Frederick's reasonings, especially the latter point, are not very unlike those actuating some of our American school boards.

Low wages necessarily restrict one's opportunities for self-development. The kind of people who would make the most desirable teachers are looking forward to occupations holding out the possibility that some day they may have a comfortable home with a respectable library and a piano in it, and, if so it may be, a garden around it. Fifteen dollars a week does not hold out much hope. What shall we say, then, of places that pay only twelve dollars a month — and then only "when school keeps"? Or what inducement does a city position hold out which pays, say, twelve dollars a week, and then subjects the tenant to the liability of being docked for unavoidable absence?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This whole question of teachers' wages is one that must be handled without further reticence. When people permit their children to be taught by illiterates — and there are not a few of them in the service — we are confronted by a state of rottenness that must be treated in the open. No State in the Union can afford to harbor a single teacher who lacks in the very elements of education. Communities that cannot pay a fair living wage must be given State support sufficient to enable them to do it. Things cannot go on much longer as they have been. If better financial inducements are not supplied soon, the State may have to adopt, in time, a sort of conscription compelling every able-minded person of mature age and other desirable qualifications to serve two or more terms as teacher in the schools, much as the able-minded men are drafted for the German army. Something radical certainly seems to be demanded by the conditions confronting us. Public sentiment must recognize the need of having the various States fix minimum standards of remuneration for teachers. Education is the most vital concern of the State.

A condition far more discouraging than unsatisfactory compensation is to be found in the petty annoyances to which teachers are constantly subjected. The children are the least of their troubles. The parents are but little more trial to the flesh. The "regulations" and the bosses of greater and lesser magnitude, they are the chief sources of discouragement. The subduing of the teacher begins before his appointment. He is sent from one mighty personage to another and is made to feel at every point that he who wants to be exalted to a school position must first humble himself. After he has obtained a provisional license he must be watchful of the idiosyncrasies and pet theories of his several superiors, not to offend their exceedingly sensitive spirits. He will be marked in various ways and according to many standards. If he is blessed with a lack of originality and carefully avoids all semblance of self-assertion, keeping closely in officially approved ruts, he may soon be in possession of a permanent license. If he can rid himself of the thought that he is a separate entity endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights, etc., — if he can forget that and will then bend his mind to a study of the prescribed conditions for promotion — he may some day be translated into a position of authority.

Teaching has many attractions. But these attractions are usually so modified by official and officious irritants that many will forego them for the sake of being able to live their own lives, even if it be in a less congenial occupation. The making out of innumerable reports and the being reported upon in almost equal measure are not to every healthy person's liking. Teachers are made to run the gauntlet of miscellaneous

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

criticism even more emphatically than clergymen. Everybody, including the clergymen, seems to be interested in keeping them meek and lowly.

Criticism may be needed. Commendation is needed. Teachers are hungering for encouragement. Their work is such that the results of it are not immediately visible. In fact, the best fruit of their work may not begin to show itself till years have passed. The girls and boys grown to womanhood and manhood may be more or less conscious of the debt of gratitude they owe to some particular teacher, but the ears that would be happy to drink in the words of commendation may long be closed. The parents of these grown-up daughters and sons quite likely never realized what a blessing the teacher was to their children. And so they, too, did not say the word that might have cheered a worthy toiler.

There are some people of whom a speedy recognition of professional merit might quite reasonably be expected. They are the principals and superintendents and other supervisory officers who owe their positions to the popular assumption that they are experts in education. But these, too, avail themselves but rarely of the privilege of commending worthy laborers. It is only charitable to assume that they do not always know good work when they see it. There are practically no fixed impersonal standards for testing efficiency in teaching. The statistical method of research suggested in the THE FORUM for the reconstruction of such standards has not been as generally accepted as its reasonableness might lead one to expect, although some progress has been made.

Criticism is formulated too much on mere impressions. The unusual is not infrequently praised as original. Those who follow a scientifically approved procedure may find themselves disapproved as routinists. It is as if physicians of moderate or no professional preparation were commended for novel ways of handling diphtheria in its initiatory stages, scorning the use of anti-toxin as routine, and letting a momentary inspiration have full sway. There naturally can be no justice exercised except in accordance with universal standards. Lacking such standards there seems to be very little excuse for scholastic rulers of greater and lesser magnitude to go about fault-finding. If constructive criticism should be insisted upon as a rule, under present conditions criticism would cease altogether. If those in authority should assume an encouraging attitude, the teachers under their sway would soon feel happier, and their good cheer might induce many to regard teaching as a desirable occupation. Perhaps the suggestion is too revolutionary. But then it need not become at once a fixed rule. Occasional encouragement will be enough of a departure to fill the hearts of the teachers with sustaining hopes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The unlovely way in which superintendents and other supervisory officers handle their teachers has its counterpart in the treatment accorded to these same authorities by the official representatives of the people whose taxes pay the salaries. Chicago exhibits a flagrant example of systematic irritation of the school superintendent. The difficulties placed in the way of Dr. Cooley by the very people who should coöperate with him appear almost insuperable. Several of the school trustees have pet educational-reform schemes of their own, and seem to regard their appointment on the school board as a title to meddle with things in which the superintendent and his assistants are supposed to be expert. They seek to discredit and humiliate the professional head of the system and to weary his spirit with unprofitable nigglings and exasperations of all sorts.

Fortunately for Chicago, Dr. Cooley is not easily dismayed. Frank, accessible, desirous of doing at all times what he considers best for the welfare of the young and the city they call their home, thoroughly tried in educational work and firm of purpose, he has thus far been able to prevent the school system from becoming a football for ambitious theorists in and outside of the board of education. But Chicago is only one of many cities where the school board holds the reins and attempts to make the superintendent go through the paces that appeal most to the majority of the trustees. Here is an example in point:

The Liliputamian Board of Education has decided to prohibit the use of all text-books prepared by teachers in the city's employ. Superintendent Conrade's grammar must go, and the collection of songs edited by Dr. Borachio, the director of music, will not be placed on the "approved" list. The chairman of the board declared that he considered it unbounded presumption on the part of any one connected with the system to become the author of a text-book, and that it was "flat burglary" to place a book by a local teacher in the hands of the children. He expressed high admiration for the superintendent, whom he regarded as an excellent authority on English grammar; but, he said, he would not let such conviction betray him into voting for books written by that gentleman. As to Dr. Borachio's song collection, he admitted that he knew nothing of music, but he felt himself compelled by virtue of his office to suspect that collection to be unfit for local use.

The only member on the board who failed to grasp the overwhelming logic of the chairman's declarations was Mr. Fish. Contrary to Liliputamian traditions, he held that the only question that should be considered was what books were best adapted for the local needs. He could not rid his simple and benighted mind of the feeling that a book written by a teacher in the system, which had proved helpful to other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

schools, might be worth trying at home. Mr. Verges caused consternation by the statement that authors were paid royalties by the publishers and that a vote for the books by Messrs. Conrade and Borachio would actually put money into the purses of these gentlemen. Mr. Verges grew very eloquent in presenting his case. He insisted that teachers must look into their own hearts for reward, and that the love of money was the root of all evil.

Superintendent Conrade asked for permission to explain. A vote of fifteen to fourteen accorded him the privilege of the floor. He said that all royalty received from the sale of his books in the city had been turned into the treasury of the board. Mr. Verdigris said he was glad to hear that Mr. Conrade returned to the city the money which the publishers had mulcted from it. He hoped that the papers would print that fact in large letters, as the superintendent had recently bought a fifteen-dollar overcoat, and some of his (Mr. Verdigris's) constituents had expressed the opinion that this extravagance was due to the use of the Conrade grammars in the local schools. Mr. Crotchet asked whether, now that the grammars were to be changed, the board would no longer get the usual royalty money. He wanted to know, too, whether under the by-laws Mr. Conrade could not be compelled to pay over whatever money he received from the sale of his books in other places? The chairman ruled that the question was out of order. The ruling was sustained.

Mr. Fish asked that Dr. Borachio be invited to present his reasons for desiring his collection of songs to be placed on the "approved" list. Granted. Dr. Borachio explained that there was a number of really great songs which pupils in the advanced grades ought to be familiar with. These songs had been collected in a book for the convenience of teachers and pupils. No other one book available for school use contained these songs. Mr. Crotchet asked whether the publishers would agree to pay a royalty to the board. Dr. Borachio replied that the matter had never been discussed with them, but that he had agreed not to accept any money from the books used in the local schools.

Mr. Fish could no longer control his feelings.

"Mr. Chairman!" he shouted, "I cannot allow this discussion to proceed unchallenged. The question is about the advisability of adopting text-books prepared by teachers in the local service. We ought to be proud to have teachers who are considered qualified to supply books which reputable publishers are willing to publish. It is a credit to us, and shows that we displayed good judgment in the appointing of these teachers. Can any one be so illogical as to declare that the books written by Messrs. Conrade and Borachio may be good enough for other places, but we cannot indorse them? For my part, I shall vote for the retention of Superintendent Conrade's grammar and the adoption of Dr. Borachio's song

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

collection. We owe them this encouragement. As to royalties, that is not our affair. We shall pay what other places pay for the books. The author is as much entitled to compensation as any other worker. I have never run up against a physician who does not charge the members of his church for professional calls, and I know that in my law practice I expect compensation for all services, whether performed in office hours or outside of them. Even clergymen have been known to accept money for officiating at weddings and funerals and on other occasions. Let us be fair with our teachers."

Mr. Verdigris called out "Question!" The chairman presented the resolution, and it was decided by a vote of twenty-eight to one that hereafter no book can be used in the schools of Liliputamia in the preparation of which any one connected with the local system had had an active part. Mr. Crotchet announced that he would shortly present a resolution forbidding the employment of any teacher capable of writing a text-book.

Liliputamia is a type, and so a few examples of the board's regulations may be interesting. All teachers are required to sign their names on entering the school on a time sheet, giving the minute of arrival. If they are more than ten minutes late, they lose the pay for that particular day. This does not mean that they are permitted to go home. If they are absent altogether they must pay besides for a substitute. Last year a heavy snowstorm crippled all traffic, and many teachers were unable to get to their schools. The magnitude of the problem of how to exercise mercy toward the malefactors and still uphold the by-laws, which represent the sublimate of the wisdom of all of Liliputamia's board, occupied three long sessions. It was finally decided that the teachers should pay only a nominal fee of five cents each.

Each teacher is required to fill out at least seven reports per day, which, after being carefully examined and approved by the principals and stamped with the superintendent's seal, must be filed where every trustee can have access to them. The superintendent must keep all letters coming to him relating to the appointment of teachers and other matters bearing upon school affairs, and each month have copies made for every member of the school board. Miss Addams did object, at one time, that the copying of all the letters twenty-nine times, so that each member might have a copy, was "foolish." The statement caused consternation, and the wisdom of the former trustees who had established the rule was promptly approved by "a vote of confidence."

The teachers must not wear shortened skirts in rainy weather; must never talk to any man near their own age except the family relation be no further distant than first cousin, or he be the superior official in the system. They must not go to the theatre, nor play cards, nor play

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any but hymn tunes on Sunday; their hair must be parted in the middle, their shoes must have low heels; when walking in the street they must not "gape about them," etc., etc. The principals are required to pay proper obeisance to any trustee who may drop in to inspect the school. One principal was suspended from his office until it could be established by an official investigation that he had intended no slight when he failed to invite Mr. Verdigris to make an address to the pupils, on a recent visit.

Disagreement with any member of the board or any by-law thereof is stamped as disloyalty. A conference of principals last month agreed to petition the board to reduce their purely clerical work, in order to give them more time for the performance of their educational duties. They called attention to the utter uselessness of many of the reports required by law. The committee to whom the principals' petition was referred stated that "they [the principals] have committed false report; moreover, they have spoken untruths; secondarily, they are slanders; sixth and lastly, they have verified unjust things; and, to conclude, they are lying knaves."

The educational situation at the Federal Capital is by no means as gratifying as the friends of the schools had hoped it would be under the new régime. This is not the fault of the board, which is composed of excellent material; neither can the superintendent and the teachers be held responsible. The difficulty is rooted in the organization, which is a cumbersome and complex one. The Washington local situation is a most difficult one to handle with absolute justice to every one. The schools are, by reason of their peculiar constitution, made part of the responsibility of every citizen of the United States. They are, in fact, the schools of the nation as much as the people of the District of Columbia. This division of responsibility may or may not be to the best interests of the schools; but there it is, and as such it must be dealt with.

Mr. Clark, of Missouri, certainly stated a cold fact when he said last spring that Congress has proved itself worse than unfit to administer the local affairs of the District. Washington represents in its organization the least American municipality in the United States. Practically all power is resident either in the District Commissioners or in such officers as the Controller of the Treasury or in the sub-committees of Congress. The control of the educational affairs is correspondingly complicated.

Going on the well-warranted assumption that he who controls the finances holds chief control in the system, we shall find that the board

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of education is extremely limited in the scope of its powers. No moneys are allowed for any purpose except those which are specified in the acts. The District Commissioners control the money. The legal adviser of the board, too, is controlled by the Commissioners. Thus far three different advisers have been assigned to the board, each with a different opinion to give. Those who have followed closely the development of affairs feel that the attitude of these Commissioners has not been a helpful one. However, even if the Commissioners should wish to give their fullest aid to the board, there would still be other difficulties to be met. The Commissioners are fenced in by acts of Congress with provisions so definite that they have almost no discretionary power. One bureau is dependent upon another bureau. Prerogatives are sensitively guarded. There is really no "city" of Washington. And the District of Columbia? Someone has called it "a satrapy of Congress," and that expresses about what it really is.

A careful study of the situation warrants several definite statements. First, as to conditions. Washington has a splendid corps of teachers. Few, if any, cities are so well favored in this respect. The superintendent is a forceful educational leader. The board appears to be not only willing, but eager to benefit the schools. It has held as many as three or four meetings a week to dispose of problems confronting the schools. The devotion and loyalty of the members as a body are acknowledged. A rare courage and high civic spirit have been revealed under very trying circumstances, newspaper talk about the handling of the appointment of teachers in the colored schools notwithstanding. The situation brought to light by investigations was such that explanations could not have benefited any one, and much serious harm would surely have been done. The board shouldered accusations and misunderstandings, convinced that it had done only what right had demanded, however its motives were misrepresented. What the board needs most of all just now is the confidence of all friends of the schools. And that it is entitled to.

The chief difficulty the board has to deal with is the constant handicap resulting from extreme limitation of its authority. No school board of any city in this country has so little real power. For example, the Washington Board has no control even over the orders for school supplies. It makes and passes and pays no bills. The selection of sites and the construction of school buildings are beyond its authority. Many of the buildings are in a wretched condition, yet the board can do nothing directly to effect needed improvements. It would seem to be reasonable that the board ought to have powers similar to those accorded to the boards of New York city, of Chicago, St. Louis, Philadelphia, Boston,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and other American cities. Then, and not till then, can it be held responsible for conditions.

It may be that President Roosevelt will come to the rescue once more. The appointment of a special commissioner to investigate and acquaint him with the educational needs of the Washington schools showed that he is deeply interested. The corps of teachers under the leadership of the new superintendent can be trusted to take care of the purely educational part of the problem. The serious problem is an administrational one. United States Commissioner Brown could furnish the President with data from the records of the Bureau of Education, which would reveal the real handicaps to progress.

The St. Louis organization may well be regarded as a model. Boston and Philadelphia have in their recent reorganizations adopted many of the best features of successful American school systems, which might also be studied with advantage to the Washington situation. Rule by ruled bureaus has proved too serious a hinderance to growth to be permitted to continue in the school administration of the District. The people of Washington ought to have a fuller share in the responsibility for the schools than they now have.

The situation wants the constructive thought of a really great man. It is not unlikely that Mr. Roosevelt will take a hand. The President is reported to be keenly disappointed in the quality of instruction and discipline afforded his own children, and therefore to have withdrawn all but one of them from the common schools. The school authorities account for this in the unfortunate taking away of eighth-grade teachers and requiring every building principal to teach all day. However that may be, the President is directly interested, and this gives rise to the hope that he will put the help of his strong hand at the service of those who are conscientiously striving for the improvement of the Washington schools.

In his latest message to Congress, President Roosevelt speaks with characteristic emphasis of the need of extending industrial training in common schools. Boys and girls who are trained "merely in literary accomplishment" he says are rendered either unfit for industrial work or reluctant to go into it. "This is a tendency," declares the President, "which should be strenuously combated." The movement for strenuously combating limitation of the schools to literary programmes is well under way.

On November 16 the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education effected a permanent organization in New York city at Cooper Union. Its objects are: To bring prominently to public

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attention the importance of industrial education as a factor in the industrial development of the United States; to provide opportunities for the study and discussion of the various phases of the problem; to make available through publications the results of experience of industrial education both in this country and abroad; and to assist in other desirable ways toward the establishment of institutions for industrial training. The proposition to organize such a society has developed widespread interest throughout the United States, as is evidenced by the hearty endorsement of many prominent men and women.

The mistake that will have to be guarded against in the introduction of industrial training is that the course does not confine itself too much to masculine pursuits, especially in the high schools. The arts of home-management and the care of children and invalids are well worthy of careful consideration. The girls are entitled to practical training in these matters. The work done by the Manhattan Trade School for Girls, under the constructive leadership of Mrs. Woolman, and by the Washington Irving High School of New York city under the principalship of Mr. McAndrew supported by Supt. Maxwell, is suggestive of the sort of development most needed at present.

Mr. Samuel B. Donelley, a member of the New York City Board of Education, presented the problem most lucidly in a recent address in which he argued that every high-school course for girls should show that its organizers recognize that the girl is going to be a woman, not a man. The studies should be based upon the best womanly instincts and should perfect and strengthen the powers that spring from them. The girl set to studying typewriting and stenography should have her attention directed at the same time to housekeeping. Business life for a woman is episodical and secondary. Self-support ought not to be held up as an ideal for young women to the rejection of marital partnership. Among other things Mr. Donelley said:

> The antipathy of trades unions to technical schools has been exaggerated. It is not general. The textile schools of Lowell and Philadelphia are not opposed by workingmen. The technical courses of the Washington Irving High school have won the approval of employers, mechanics, and citizens, because of the school's service in supplying workers well advanced in the theory and practice of its special industries.
>
> The purpose of a girl's industrial or technical instruction should be, first of all, the perfection of the woman herself. This is the German, the Belgian, and the French idea in those countries that have advanced girls' technical schools the farthest. Let the school assume first that its graduates will marry and have homes and families of their own. During the time between their graduation and their marriage let the young women be able to support themselves by stenography or typewriting or dressmaking or millinery or designing, or by managing the home for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

father or mother or brother; but keep enough of womanly work prominently before all the girls so that their natural instincts shall be strengthened — that the school shall graduate women, not mere industrial units.

What we want is a good woman who can use the typewriter, if necessary; a good woman who can, if needed, take a place in the designing studio. There is, and should be, a marked distinction between the purposes of a boys' technical school and a girls'. To fill commercial or industrial positions should not be the only or even the main ambition of the girl graduate. Let her best natural instincts be encouraged. Let her look forward to being a good woman, with all that this implies.

This matter naturally brings up again the old question of the desirability of co-education in high schools and colleges. Chicago University decided quite recently upon a definite segregation of the sexes in the college. There seems to be no longer any doubt that co-education beyond the elementary schools entails more loss than gain to the individual pupils. As the importance of a special training for women is becoming more recognized by a progressive civilization, the question will be seen in a clearer light than has been the case in the past.

The confusing claims made for "character formation" are largely responsible for the prevailing diversity of opinion. The common-sense view would probably declare that "character formation" is not the business of the schools at all, that character is an individual matter and will take care of itself more largely than pedagogical wisdom can contrive.

Co-education appears to be chiefly a temperamental question. It is a good thing for some people and not for others. According as one sees the good or the harm one either advocates or opposes it. Furthermore, it is a financial question. Co-education is less expensive than the other kind of education, and so there are more advocates raised up in its favor. Industrial training, aside from infusing a new spirit in school work, is bound in its development to reveal the most sensible standpoint from which to judge the educational needs of young people.

Those who desire to inform themselves more fully concerning the much-discussed new English Education Bill will be interested in the bulletin recently issued by the Bureau of Education. It is the first official document issued since Dr. Elmer Elsworth Brown's appointment as Commissioner. Miss Anna Tolman Smith is the editor of it. A lucid and comprehensive view is presented of the law which has stirred Great Britain as no educational matter ever did before. Miss Smith has with skilful hands freed the main propositions from the mass of confusing detail which encumbers them in the general text of the bill, and exhibits them in the form of fundamental principles of organization. She has rendered the further service of setting the bill in its his-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

toric perspective, so that the progress it marks in British national life is more clearly emphasized. The main clauses of the bill are projected by means of citations from the speeches of eminent political leaders in support and in opposition. A helpful index is added which is interpretative as well as directive.

A remarkable "Social Education Congress" was recently held in Boston. It emphasized anew the great thought for which America is indebted to Prof. John Dewey of Columbia University, that "all education proceeds by the participation of the individual in the social consciousness of the race," that "education is the fundamental method of social progress and reform." In the past education has been too largely regarded as the bringing up of self-sufficient individuals — "harmonious development of powers," character formation, etc. Now the industrial and social relationships are to receive more adequate attention. The congress at Boston shows that the new gospel is beginning to be understood, and will soon spread over the land, defining anew to the schools the specific purposes they must serve.

OSSIAN H. LANG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A FEW BOOKS ON SHAKESPEARE.

THERE is, I believe, a saying among publishers that no member of their craft — or, as one prefers to term it, their profession — ever ultimately lost money on an edition of Shakespeare. Perhaps the fact thus vouched for, if fact it be, is partly responsible for the numerous competing editions of the works of the dramatist. But publishers must have lost money on many a book dealing with Shakespeare's life and writings, hence the increasing number of such publications must be accounted for in the main on grounds other than commercial. The supreme position of Shakespeare in our literature; the spread of English studies, especially among post-graduates in our universities; the growth, in a democratic age, of the craving for distinction, which finds a convenient outlet in literary and scholarly pursuits; these and other reasons amply account for the rising tide of Shakespeareana that threatens to swamp our libraries.

That books devoted to Shakespeare are accumulating very rapidly is a proposition which no one will dispute, and for which, in consequence, proofs are rarely or never demanded. They can be readily found in bibliographies designed for the use of scholars, or, indeed, by a glance through the lists of books received by any literary journal in good standing. One such journal, during the six months just elapsed, acknowledged the receipt of five new books and one reprint, all of which contained the word "Shakespeare" in their titles. A new edition of the complete works was advertised in the last number examined, and was probably received a few days after that number was issued. Doubtless some plays intended for school use, and some doctor's dissertations, were not submitted for review. I have an impression that this showing was below rather than above the average; but it would not be worth while to take the trouble to confirm or to disprove the point. The tide of Shakespeareana is steadily rising, and the critic who attempts to stay it will find himself as powerless as Canute.

Two hundred years ago the case was very different. The rise was beginning, but he would have been a shrewd man who could have foretold at all approximately the height that would be attained in a couple of centuries. During the year 1706 the famous antiquary Thomas Hearne, with ten years of service still before him in his beloved Bodleian, kept

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a diary which, with excerpts from his correspondence, fills nearly 163 octavo pages in the edition of his "Remarks and Collections," now being slowly given to the world by the Oxford Historical Society. Hearne was not merely an expert in coins, in classical scholarship, and in English antiquities, especially the series of old chronicles; he was also not a little of a gossip, and he jotted down all sorts of literary news, including, among other items, many titles of books and pamphlets just from the press. Yet during the year 1706, if we may trust the index, his indefatigable pen did not once trace the name of William Shakespeare.

That name occurs but once in the seven volumes that carry the diary and the correspondence from July 4, 1705, to September 22, 1722. This single Shakespearean entry is to be found in the second volume under date of July 30, 1709. It records the Oxford tradition that "Shakespear as he us'd to pass from London to Stratford upon Avon" would always stop at "y^{e} Crown Tavern in Oxford, which was kept by one Davenant," and it goes on to give the familiar facts and surmises with regard to the relations between the dramatist and the tavern-keeper's son, who was afterward Sir William Davenant. It ends with the anecdote:

"'Tis further said that one day going from school a grave Doctor in Divinity met him, and ask'd him, *child whither art thou going in such haste?* to w^{ch} the child reply'd, *O Sir, my godfather is come to Town. & I am going to ask his blessing.* To w^{ch} the D^{r}. said, *Hold Child, you must not take the name of God in vaine.*"

With a little manipulation this story might be well applied to many people of to-day who speak of Shakespeare in terms extravagant even for him. It is quite apparent that Hearne gave up thirteen lines of his diary in its printed form to this Shakespearean item, not so much because he thought it a good story, as because it was a tradition of his beloved Oxford. It is further noteworthy that he employed the phrase, "a very Eminent Poet," not in connection with Shakespeare, who received a slur upon his morals and not a single compliment, but in connection with Davenant. Yet Hearne was not without interest in poetry, especially in whatever had been consecrated by the tenth muse — that of Age. He was interested in Chaucer, as befitted a friend of John Urry, and he devoted some space to that monument of dulness "A Mirror for Magistrates." Hearne, however, was a cloistered student, and many a specialist of to-day might keep a diary for years without mentioning Shakespeare at all. Yet Hearne had a contemporary who was as little of a cloisteredstudent as one often encounters. He was a pamphleteer, a journalist, a politician, a secret-service man, a writer of fiction — a jack of all trades. His name was Daniel Defoe, and his enormous bibliography may be estimated roughly at between 250 and 300 items. He

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had a very considerable knowledge of English poetry and was fond of quoting it. To-day such a literary man of the people would be almost sure to quote Shakespeare more than any other poet, even though, like Defoe, he held the acted drama in no high estimation. Yet, if one were to venture to infer from the quotations Defoe makes from Shakespeare the extent of his knowledge of the great dramatist and enthusiasm for his works, one would be almost compelled to believe that the author of "Robinson Crusoe" was more impressed by the doggerel epitaph beginning

"Good friend, for Jesus' sake forbear"

than by any noble passage or scene in the thirty-seven plays.

Such an inference would not be fair to Defoe, but it is plain that he and Hearne may be used, as I am using them here, as foils to Shakespearean enthusiasts and students of to-day, in order that we may clearly perceive how great an increase of fame the lapse of two centuries has brought to the dramatist. It is by no means true, as has often been pointed out, that Germany taught England to appreciate the chief glory of her glorious drama; but it is true that to-day Shakespeare has become much more completely and emphatically a national and a popular possession than would have been thought possible by most people a hundred years after his death. And it is to Defoe's credit that he had a faint vision of the fame awaiting the poet whose words were so seldom on his lips. In the second volume of his "Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain," published in 1725, he wrote apropos of a visit to Stratford:

> At this last Town, going into the Parish Church, we saw the Monument of Old *Shakespear*, the famous Poet, and whose Dramatick Performances so justly maintain his Character among the British Poets; and perhaps will do so to the End of Time.

My quotations from these eighteenth-century worthies, while keeping us too long from the recent books on Shakespeare with which this paper professes to deal, are not, after all, out of harmony with the tone and setting of the first book that must be noticed — the most important and interesting of late contributions to Shakespearean scholarship — Prof. Thomas R. Lounsbury's "The Text of Shakespeare."[1] This, the third instalment of his admirable and extensive work on "Shakespearean Wars," is really an elaborate account of an eighteenth-century literary controversy, of which the protagonists were Alexander Pope, author of

[1] "The Text of Shakespeare." Its History from the Publication of the Quartos and Folios down to and including the Publication of the Editions of Pope and Theobald. By Thomas R. Lounsbury, L.H.D., LL.D., Professor of English in Yale University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The Dunciad," and the Shakespearean scholar, Lewis Theobald, the original hero of that famous and infamous poem. If he had entitled his volume "Pope and Theobald," Prof. Lounsbury could have found his justification in 500 out of the 600 pages of his treatise; for his earlier chapters on the quartos and folios and Rowe's editions, while sufficient for his purposes, are almost forgotten by readers as they follow the tortuous course of Pope's revenge upon the scholar who exposed that arch-poet's shortcomings as an editor. In other words, Pope and Theobald occupy the centre of the stage, much as Voltaire did in the second of Prof. Lounsbury's volumes, "Shakespeare and Voltaire"; but, as he was in duty bound to get the name of Shakespeare into his title, and, as three names would have been cumbrous and that of Theobald, thanks to Pope's manœuvres, surprising to most people in such a conjunction, there was nothing for our modern scholar to do but to give a book intensely alive with biographical and controversial interest the somewhat dead and deadening title of "The Text of Shakespeare."

To say of Prof. Lounsbury's latest volume, what one must say also of his second and of many pages of his first entitled "Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist," that it is probably more important to the student of eighteenth-century literature than it is to the student of Shakespeare, is not in the least to suggest that he has been guilty of divagation from his subject. The attitude of the eighteenth century toward the art and the text of the greatest of dramatic poets throws a light upon that century's criticism and scholarship which is even more illuminating than the light thrown by its attitude toward Spenser and Milton; and criticism and scholarship are more closely connected with creative literature in the eighteenth century than in any other period of modern times.

If, then, Shakespeare's works sometimes seem in this volume to occupy only the inglorious position of the bone over which two dogs are growling and tugging, we must blame not the author, but his subject; and we must console ourselves with the thought that it is only through Prof. Lounsbury's extraordinary zeal and acumen that Theobald has received his full rehabilitation from duncedom to a high place among Shakespearean scholars, and that Pope's moral obliquities, already partly revealed in his manipulation of his correspondence, are set forth in a way which strikingly illustrates the truth of the adage that, though the mills of the gods grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small.

It is between 150 and 200 years since Pope revenged himself upon Theobald and other enemies in "The Dunciad" of 1729 — the best form of the poem, which has been superseded by the edition of 1743 — and since, by almost unimaginable trickery and intrigue and by the equally unrivalled force of his stinging satiric genius, he succeeded in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imposing upon the world false conceptions with regard to the moral and intellectual worth of his victims, to say nothing of false notions with regard to his own lofty rectitude of purpose. Shakespeare had died more than 100 years before, little dreaming, humane soul that he was, that the works he had not had time or else inclination to collect would occasion the publication of what is probably the most malignant book in English literature.

Whether Pope died in 1744 believing that the vile means by which he had won his victory — not over Theobald's rival edition of Shakespeare, but over Theobald's just fame and over the mild reputations of scores of lesser men — would never be discovered is a question we need not pause to discuss. Certain it is, however, that, while the colonial partisans of Mather Byles could not induce the world to accept their favorite's claims to the throne of poetry vacated by Pope, it is an American who has at last, not precisely overturned the considerably less honorable seat among the poets allotted Pope of late years, but at least stripped him of some of his robes and made from them waist-cloths for his despoiled and shivering adversaries.

It is due to Prof. Lounsbury's modesty to say that he does not believe he has done anything of the sort described in the above over-figurative sentence. He thinks that the world has taken the side of the man of genius and that it will continue to regard Theobald, probably the most happy of all the amenders of Shakespeare's text, as a "piddling" dunce, and the rest of Pope's victims, with the exception of Bentley, Defoe, and a few others, as entirely negligible persons.

This position, it seems to me, assumes a greater popular knowledge of "The Dunciad" than probably exists to-day, and it overlooks the large part that training in selected English classics plays in our secondary education public and private. The vast majority of the readers of the next generation, at least in America, will begin whatever browsing or study they may undertake in the field of English literature with general notions with regard to leading writers derived from the teachers and the editors of the text-books of their youth. These teachers and editors, and even the writers of encyclopædia articles upon Pope, will sooner or later, without, I am afraid, in most cases, drawing directly from Prof. Lounsbury's voluminous but very witty and readable treatise, gather the gist of our distinguished scholar's investigations and present the character of Pope and the story of his writing "The Dunciad" in a fashion fairly consonant with the facts. Pupils thus instructed, if they remember the names of Pope and Theobald at all, are not likely to go egregiously astray in their notions with regard to the relations of the two men.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prof. Lounsbury, whatever exceptions minute scholars may take to this or that statement or inference, has pulled down and builded again, not "better than he knew," but more effectively than some of his modest remarks might indicate. And he has rendered a new critical edition of "The Dunciad" and a revising of Pope's biography necessary, and a fuller life of Theobald desirable — despite the fulness and excellence of his own treatment of the great commentator's career; and, all the while, he has been steadily nearing the goal he originally set himself, of tracing the history of the works and fame of William Shakespeare.

To pass from Prof. Lounsbury's volume to the last book of Mr. Sidney Lee[1] is not altogether to get rid of the eighteenth century — for that is the background of one of the latter writer's essays — but it is certainly to get much nearer and to keep much closer to Shakespeare. This is not to say that Mr. Lee is a Shakespearean specialist and nothing more. Any one who has tracked his varied scholarship through the volumes of the great work which came to a conclusion under his editorship, the "Dictionary of National Biography," will know that such a statement would be absurd. Readers of his history of Queen Victoria's life and reign and of his edition of Herbert of Cherbury's delightful "Autobiography" will need no other proof of the range of his interests.

Nevertheless, there can be little doubt that the services performed by his "Life of Shakespeare," by his studies in the sources of Shakespeare's sonnets, and by his facsimile editions of the folios, have made Mr. Lee stand before the public primarily as a professed Shakespearean; and, although such a volume as his comparatively recent "Great English Men of the Sixteenth Century" makes us feel that perhaps it would be more just to speak of him as a distinguished student of Elizabethan literature, it is hardly doubtful that he himself would very willingly admit that Shakespeare is the true centre of his studies, the very god of his idolatry.

Mr. Lee's latest contribution to Shakespearean literature is based, as all his other books are, upon a scholarship that is remarkably solid and sane. Hence it is sure to appeal to the limited audience interested in English and, particularly, in Shakespearean studies. The book should, however, reach a wider audience, as the titles of four out of its eleven essays would seem to show. These are "Shakespeare and the Modern Stage," "Mr. Benson and Shakespearean Drama," "The Municipal Theatre," and "The Commemoration of Shakespeare in London."

The paper last named seems at first thought purely local in its application; but London is still the centre of the Anglo-Saxon world, and any

[1] "Shakespeare and the Modern Stage, with Other Essays." By Sidney Lee. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

permanent memorial of Shakespeare erected there must belong, in a very true sense, to all who speak the English language. The three other papers deal with the important problem of how the great body of the Shakespearean drama can be best presented to the theatre-going public of our own and of future times. Hence they have an interest not merely for students and persons who care for literature, but also for all lovers of the acted drama and for all who see in the theatre an efficient instrument of civic progress.

Although it is composed of papers written at different times and for various occasions, and although it breaks into three divisions, the group already cited, contributions to historical and biographical Shakespeareana, and Shakespearean essays properly so called, the volume possesses more unity than such collections of occasional addresses and articles are wont to have. This unity is given partly by Mr. Lee's constant reiteration of the fact that Shakespeare's works and fame are a most important element of what may be termed the culture-inheritance of the Western world — an element the æsthetic significance of which is equalled if not surpassed by its truly practical utility in the highest sense — partly by the sober, earnest tone with which he presents his facts and ideas and arguments, and by the thorough, workmanlike treatment he accords to every topic.

He is as meticulously careful in tracing the history of a questionable hoax perpetrated by George Steevens as he is in recording the bits of oral tradition that enable us to piece out Shakespeare's scanty biography. He does not mind repeating himself, provided he can thereby the better press his point home. There is no coruscation of humor or exuberance of spirits and knowledge such as we find in Lowell; there is not a trace of Matthew Arnold's jauntiness or of his apostolic unction the æsthetic Pater might just as well have never lived, written, and died so far as Mr. Lee is concerned. There is little or no divagation, or indulgence in intellectual gambols, or culling the flowers of rhetoric, or spinning the threads of subtle analysis, to be discovered in any of these essays. They are the straightforward deliverances of a man who is master of every subject he treats and vitally interested in them all. This vital interest and this business-like competence impart those elements of the sound and the sincere which are more important than any others to the production of catholic criticism. Hence it would be a mistake, I think, to rank Mr. Lee only among our most distinguished scholars in English. He is also entitled to an honorable place among latter-day critics by virtue of his knowledge, his zeal for the things of the mind, his robust common sense.

These merits are all displayed in the leading essay which gives the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

volume its title, "Shakespeare and the Modern Stage." Instead of the spectacularly splendid presentations of a few of Shakespeare's plays which, since the days of Charles Kean, have cost rash managers thousands of pounds, and, by banishing other Shakespearean dramas from the stage, have contracted the knowledge and the imaginative enjoyment of two generations of audiences, Mr. Lee would like to witness in London and New York the adoption of the methods which have made it possible for the Burg-Theater of Vienna to give the citizens of that capital an average of two performances a week of frequently varied plays of Shakespeare at very reasonable prices.

He dwells in this essay and elsewhere on the deadening effects produced upon the imagination by the obsession of the spectacular, and with equal insistence on the moral and intellectual benefits to be derived by the mass of mankind from that interpretation of Shakespeare's works which is alone given on a stage not dominated by a single star, but filled by a company of trained, intelligent, and sympathetic performers. In subsequent essays he shows how municipal theatres of excellent quality have been and may still be secured for any city that will seriously set itself to obtain them; and he shows also how the experiments of such managers as Phelps and Benson give lessons of encouragement to all who are interested in elevating the art of acting and in keeping alive upon the stage not a few chosen plays only, but almost the entire body of the Shakespearean drama.

The essays belonging to this practical group are doubtless, in a utilitarian sense, the most valuable in the book; but the scholar and the lover of literature will probably turn with more pleasure to such papers as "Pepys and Shakespeare," "Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Playgoer," "Shakespeare in Oral Tradition" — a very valuable and well ordered collection of data which proves that, after all, we are not so entirely ignorant about Shakespeare the man as we often complain of being — "Aspects of Shakespeare's Philosophy," "Shakespeare and Patriotism," and "Shakespeare in France."

To discuss these essays at all adequately would require a good deal of space, and would be attended by the disconcerting conviction that any reader would do better to consult Mr. Lee himself on each interesting topic. It will suffice to say that it was quite worth while to gather the papers from periodicals, to give the date of each in the commendable French fashion, and to furnish the volume with an index. I was personally glad to read the well-balanced essay on "Shakespeare and Patriotism," and to observe the sound point of view taken in the following sentences, which belong to the paper on "Aspects of Shakespeare's Philosophy"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Yet there are occasions when, without detracting from the omnipotence of Shakespeare's dramatic instinct, one may tentatively infer that Shakespeare gave voice through his created personages to sentiments which were his own. The Shakespearean drama must incorporate somewhere within its vast limits the personal thoughts and passions of its creator, even although they are for the most part absorbed past recognition in the mighty mass, and no critical chemistry can with confidence disentangle them.

These sentences mean, I take it, that Mr. Lee perceives that constant insistence upon the objective character of Shakespeare's art is bound to discourage attempts on the part of constructive and sympathetic criticism to arrive at some comprehension of the wonderful personality behind the plays. It is well enough to crush all foolish and rash attempts to portray the man Shakespeare; but it is not well to cut ourselves off from the chance that some day a great critic may discover in the dramas traces of their maker from which and from the facts we already have he may be able to put together a more satisfactory biography than any that has yet appeared.

In the case of Shakespeare, no fact or notion may be safely cast aside without careful examination. Mr. Lee's essays on "Pepys and Shakespeare" and "Shakespeare in Oral Tradition" made me wish that a band of scholars would supplement the work already done in "Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse," and bring together practically every reference to the poet that can be found in English literature between his death and at least the middle of the eighteenth century. Even such a small fact as that Andrew Marvell seems to have known "A Midsummer Night's Dream"; such an inference as that Lady Winchilsea was acquainted not only with several of the plays, but with the sonnets also; such a description, slight though it be, as Mrs. Katharine Philips, "the Matchless Orinda," gave of a performance of "Othello" she once witnessed in Dublin — all such evidences of the growth of the dramatist's fame should be methodically gathered and arranged. What Marvell on the one hand and Pepys on the other thought of "A Midsummer Night's Dream" can scarcely be termed matters of great moment, and we might have inferred that the former did not like the latter find Shakespeare's charming creation of the fancy an "insipid ridiculous play"; but there would be an advantage in having every scrap of early Shakespearean criticism, whether eulogistic or not, accessible to students.

Meanwhile we may be thankful that publishers and scholars do not confine themselves to books on Shakespeare, but spend part of their energy in endeavoring to give us Shakespeare himself in increasingly more worthy and convenient forms. The admirable scholarship which Prof. William Alan Neilson of Harvard has put into his preparation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the text of the recent "Cambridge" edition of Shakespeare's complete works,[1] and into the writing of the short introductions to the separate plays, will certainly benefit both readers and students.

No more attractive single-volume edition exists. The type, though necessarily small, is clear, the book lies open at one's will, the lines are numbered by fives, — everything, in short, invites to the use of this edition when one wishes to have the entire body of Shakespeare's work in one's hands. It follows, I think, that readers as well as students will be more than usually alive to the merits of Prof. Neilson's editorial apparatus — to the sanity and suggestiveness of his biographical sketch, to the conciseness and accuracy of his introductions, and to the care with which he has marked off all modern additions in the way of *dramatis personæ* and stage directions. His radical procedure in frankly adopting a modern punctuation will probably please readers, if they notice it, and raise questions among scholars. His rearrangement of the plays according to chronology within the three well-recognized divisions of Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies, by which "The Tempest" appears as the seventeenth instead of the first play, is likely to give qualms to readers rather than to scholars. Both innovations seem to me to be worth trying, and it is needless to approve the small amount of textual apparatus in such an edition and the consequent saving of space for a good glossary.

These are homely matters, calling for no rhetorical rhapsodies, and not even affording material for an effective close of an article. They are important, however, not only in view of the conservatism that characterizes most editions of any classic, but also in view of the fact that everything which tends to make more feasible the reading of Shakespeare in his entirety advances the cause of popular education in a way and to an extent that would be impossible in the case of any other author. Criticism and scholarship have done much, and will continue to do much, for Shakespeare's fame; but the reading of Shakespeare himself has done and will do more. Prof. Neilson has deserved well of the readers of Shakespeare because he has made access to the works of the master poet in some respects more convenient than it has ever been before, and because he has done this through the unostentatious application of labor and scholarship that might easily, without blame, have been employed more strictly in his own behalf.

W. P. Trent.

[1] Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME RECENT GUIDES TO CULTURE.

SINCE the days at least when Ruskin, in "Sesame and Lilies," and Arnold, in various treatises, of which "Culture and Anarchy" is the chief, laid down directions for reading and stated a high aim for all intellectual and spiritual endeavor, there has been wanting neither theoretical discussion nor practical counsel on the momentous question as to the best ways of making books minister to the higher interests of mankind. In a general sense, everything that teaches or stimulates man to set a value on any kind of life other than the material or the sensational or the hysterically emotional may be called an instrument of culture. Hence the term in this sense is hard to fix. And since, on the other hand, the sages and prophets of the world have been in substantial agreement that the life is more than meat and the body more than raiment, it is only the wisest of mortals who can add a jot to our general knowledge of the precepts that should rule a well-regulated and successful life. Yet books preaching and teaching culture are as numerous as ever; indeed, the day that saw their ceasing would be sad. It may not be amiss, therefore, to take from the present time a number of books falling under that description, to see what counsel they have to offer, what significance and value is theirs, and of what kind of writing they are typical.

"Culture," said Arnold in the preface to "Literature and Dogma," "is indispensably necessary, and culture is reading; but reading with a purpose to guide it, and with system. He does a good work who does anything to help this; indeed, it is the one essential service now to be rendered to education." The remark, whether it be the cause or not, may stand for the type of motive underlying many a modern treatise on the subject. There have been famous lists of the one hundred "best books," now depreciated by a more catholic taste; we all know of numerous pamphlets on the subject of what to read; and the literary counsel "featured" in popular periodicals for domestic consumption is beyond analysis: they all tell us what books, both classical and contemporary, it is best for us to taste, to chew, or to digest. In such trains of advice one may be reasonably certain, before opening any given treatise, to find stock ideas: books are our priceless possession; you should, in Lowell's words, "read what will make you think

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rather than dream;" newspapers are a public menace and should be read swiftly, merely for the sake of the important news; excessive novel-reading is deleterious to the moral fibre; the Bible is the best of all books for culture. Indeed, these ideas cannot too often be repeated, for we do not hear a tithe as much about them as we do about passing politics, the stock market, theatres, and athletics; but the specific interest in the present guides to culture lies in the variations from such worthy remarks and the fresh applications of them.

In "Books, Culture, and Character"[1] an assembly of a number of detached and somewhat generalizing addresses with a central purpose, not too exactly connoted by the title, Mr. Larned warmly decries the universal reading of newspapers. As an exponent of culture, he says: "I speak soberly when I say that the greatest antagonism to be met and overcome is that of the vulgarized part of the newspaper press;" the problem is "how to win readers of the general mass from unwholesome newspapers to wholesome books, or how to change the spirit of the common newspapers of the day from flippancy to sobriety." So, too, he deprecates the vulgarity of common novels, though amply recognizing the value of the better representatives of fiction. These are, however, details. The remedy lies in the public library, of which he is the earnest advocate. His aim, a broad popular culture, is expressed in these sentences:

> It is better for the majority of people that they should be readers in a general way, rather than students, because they have not the leisure nor the freedom of mind for large subjects of study, and it is ill for the mind to focus it on small themes too exclusively. . . . I feel no doubt in the least that breadth of culture is more important, on the whole, than its depth, to the generality of mankind; that their character and capability as members of society are affected more by the area of their knowledge and by the diversity of their acquaintance with good literature than by the minuteness of either.

As an aid in the determining of excellence, Mr. Larned has a wholesome test, which indeed has been much used ever since Coleridge expressed it in another form:

> The conclusive test for a book which offers pleasure rather than knowledge is the question, "Does it leave any kind of wholesome and fine feeling in the mind of one who reads it?"

More particularly, Mr. Larned is an earnest believer in the wide reading of history and whatever books transmit to us the treasures of the past; in science, which teaches us what really is now; and in the poetry that

[1] J. N. Larned: "Books, Culture, and Character." Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kindles the imagination and stimulates the life of true emotion. In general, the book is an able presentation of a sound point of view.

Mr. Larned is an enthusiast and an idealist, and therefore rather inclines to content himself with a statement of the ideal than to busy himself with the question of ways and means. Furthermore, in pursuing his ideal he perhaps loses sight of one or two minor points of some practical value. It is an open question, for example, whether the public library, for which he is so winning an advocate, does not do its share in fostering a taste for the cheap novels that he decries. Doubtless the public library opens the doors of a not very profound knowledge to willing seekers, but its hospitable portal is also open to the inrush of desultory novel-readers; nor do we know many libraries which do not rather cater to the public taste than guide and restrict it.

Nor, again, is such a paragraph as the following, however good as an ideal, capable of being analyzed in terms of actual fact; for if the "discipline of thoroughness" be an admirable thing, it is valuable in its applications, and hence carries a condemnation of discursiveness and superficiality:

> At the same time, I would urge, as I say, the specializing of some object in the intellectual pursuits of every man and woman; not to the exclusion of other subjects and objects, but to their subordination. Let there be one thing for each of us that we try to know somewhere nearly to the bottom, with certainty, precision, exactness; not so much for the value of the knowledge itself, as for the value of the discipline of thoroughness. If it is something in the line of our daily occupations,— something bearing upon our particular work in the world, mechanical, commercial, professional it may be, — so much the better. Then, around that one centre of positive study, turning on it as on a pivot, let there be circle after circle drawn of wide discursive reading.

Nor is it captious to say that Mr. Larned's dictum on Boswell's "Johnson" is visionary rather than reasonable:

> Who can read it without wishing that some figure more impressive in human history stood where a strange fortune has put the sturdy old Tory, in the wonderful light that reveals him so immortally?

It lacks reason because whether or not the "figure more impressive in human history" would, if presented by a Boswell, have been more momentous than the actual picture is mere guess-work. I dare say that Johnson was a great deal more interesting as a personality (that is Boswell's point) than Cæsar, or Shakespeare, or Napoleon; but, of course, I don't know, and, being ignorant, must accept Johnson as he stands. There is nothing to do except to take the material that Boswell has given us. To wish otherwise would be to ask for a recasting of history. Such random remarks as that of Mr. Larned's mar

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sound factual criticism. One may be pardoned for speaking of such trifling defects in a stimulating book, but it is in the interest of sound culture that they be noticed.

Mr. Larned's book to some degree shows the limitation under which many good treatises suffer. They deal with what ought to be to the exclusion of what is; whereas no right-thinking and efficient reformer can hope to move very far without a knowledge of actual conditions. Otherwise he fights as one that beateth the air or must content himself with addressing an audience with whom he is already substantially in accord. Prof. Brandes's short sketch on reading[1] is in this respect an improvement over Mr. Larned's essays. No less enthusiastic in tone than the latter, it would seem to have a better grasp of the general fact. This is stated in these words:

> The simplest experience of the world proves that a work of great excellence may deeply move one person, while it leaves another untouched; and that a book which has influenced one strongly in one's youth may lose such influence over one's later years. There is practically nothing that every man can read at every time.
>
> This fact is not particularly evident, of course, for the simple reason that nowadays very few people can be said to read at all, or to enjoy reading, or get any good out of it. Out of a hundred persons able to read, ninety generally read nothing but newspapers — a species of reading which demands no exertion. Most people, for that matter, read without any particular attentiveness. . . . And many people, after all, are not accustomed to understand fully. They are like young people reading books in foreign languages, who neglect to refer to the dictionary for words they do not understand; they infer them from the sense, so they say; that is, they understood half, and are content with that.
>
> In the case of works the nature of which is not intended to be grasped by the intellect, as, for example, in lyric poetry, readers generally relinquish beforehand all idea of understanding exactly what the author means. An acquaintance of mine, in a company of ladies, once tried the experiment of reading aloud Goethe's "The God and the Bayadere," beginning each verse with the last line, and reading upward. The rhymes fell without intermission, all the melody of the verses was retained — and every one was charmed.

With such facts in view, Prof. Brandes sets himself three questions for answer — Why should we read? What should we read? and How should we read? The answer to the first is somewhat unconventional. Instead of claiming for books the all-important place, he regards them as in many ways inferior to pictures and sculpture as instruments of culture, and he adds: "Books can at best present only a theory." Hence they are, with intelligent people, merely a supplement to knowledge derived from observation. On the other hand, they have great value in that they "set thoughts in motion," and it is to their credit that "they

[1] George Brandes: "On Reading: An Essay." Duffield & Co., 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are seldom so inane as people"; moreover they make us alive to the value of things; they are entertaining; and, if not palpably moral, are excellent spiritual guides.

His chief advice in answer to the second question is an adjuration to shun general surveys and miscellaneous reading in favor of deep and intensive study of what interests us. In calling this the only safe road to culture, he steps out of the broad and primrose path of Mr. Larned, and is more in accord with Stevenson's dictum that "culture is not measured by the greatness of the field which is covered by our knowledge, but by the nicety with which we can perceive relations in that field, whether great or small." Dangerous books, "which speculate in the youthful reader's sensual impulses, or appeal to his idleness or frivolity . . . that represent base and low things as admirable, or disseminate prejudices, and throw a hateful light on liberal-mindedness, or the pursuit of freedom," and wearisome books, like dry-as-dust history, are to be eschewed. Most important of all is the object of reading — to gain new ideas, to increase our sense of relationships, to preserve the moral essence of things, and to strengthen moral fibre.

In one even more interesting respect Prof. Brandes is at some variance with a popular dictum — that which proclaims the Bible to be the best of all books. The Bible usually heads the list of the "hundred best," and he who would plead for discrimination in his praise would occupy an uncommon position. Prof. Brandes's words on this question are so characteristic of his point of view and his manner that they are worth quoting:

> There is one Book of Books that is generally regarded as the most suitable of all for general and constant reading, *the* very best book, — the Bible. Few books, however, prove so conclusively as this that the bulk of mankind cannot read at all. The so-called Old Testament comprises, as is well known, all that is left to us of the ancient Hebrew literature of a period of eight hundred years, together with some few books in Greek. It includes writings of the most various value and the most various origin, which have come down to us with texts comparatively recently edited, often corrupt and further marred by endless copyings; — writings ascribed, as a rule to men who never wrote them, nearly all of them difficult to understand, and demanding extensive knowledge in order to be read with the smallest degree of profit.
>
> Certain of the books of the Old Testament, like the collection which bears the name of Isaiah, contain some of the sublimest extant poetry of antiquity — a witness to the purest craving for righteousness, the highest religious development to be found on earth at that time, seven hundred and fifty or five hundred years before our era. Others, as for example the Chronicles, are of less value, and are not strictly accurate in their historical recitals.
>
> There is much evidence that such reading confuses men's minds.
>
> Yet if the acknowledged "best" book cannot be called good for every one, then how much less the classics!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here Prof. Brandes undoubtedly, to some degree, accounts for a regrettable fact in modern culture — the Bible, since it has ceased to be of tremendous moment to the eternal welfare of mankind, is not popularly read — as has been the case with the classics since Greek and Latin have ceased to be of moment as required subjects for entrance to college. Incidentally, this change of attitude is suggestive of our evaluation of literature as opposed to information: so long as the Bible was thought to contain the most important of all facts, it was read, but when degraded from the dignity of science to the level of literature it ceased to be interesting. The truth of the matter is that people care much more for information than for the finer sorts of pleasure. That the fact of the present neglect of the Bible is true can be heard in the constant cry against the modern indifference, and the ignorance of the rising and the risen generations in regard to the Scriptures.

But if one would reform this deplorable state of affairs, one must go deeper, must ascertain the causes, and apply the remedy. In this respect, Prof. Brandes's suggestion — that the book is incomprehensible to the modern reader — is valuable, even if not wholly true. To say that it is incomprehensible is but another way of saying that it is not interesting, to people of to-day, in comparison with more modern ways of thought, feeling, and expression. Since, however, its place as an invaluable work of literature is unquestioned, and since, as a matter of fact, it seems to have ceased, for the present generation, to be the only sufficient rule for faith and practice, any one who would tell us why it ought to be read, and would succeed in making us read it, would, in the highest sense, be furnishing us with a guide to culture of especial importance.

Such in part is the arduous and pleasing task which Prof. Gardiner has set himself in his able and interesting study of the Bible as literature.[1] Let it be understood that there are, ideally, in treatises of this sort, two possible subjects — the quality and value of the Bible as literature — which would of itself be sufficient to stimulate the inquiring spirit — and the means to be used in arousing the uninterested, the dull, and the perverse young barbarian from his play to a consideration of this book as a means of enriching his intellectual and spiritual life. It is to the first of these that Prof. Gardiner confines himself: "My object has been," he says in the preface, "to make students as familiar as possible with the English Bible, and to throw light on its literary forms by bringing together facts from the history of the translation into English."

[1] J. H. Gardiner: "The Bible as English Literature." Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is unnecessary to describe Prof. Gardiner's book in detail. A good general idea of it may he had from a short examination of the subjects with which it deals and the points of excellence which are brought out. Aside from the historical introduction, there are three subjects: a descriptive account of the chief forms of writing in the Bible — that is, the narrative, the poetry, the wisdom books, the epistles of the New Testament, the prophecy, and the apocalypse, each of which is treated in a separate chapter; the history of the translation into English; and a final chapter on the place and influence of the translation on the course of English literature.

In dealing with the first of these subjects, Prof. Gardiner's way is usually to show the different types of writing under each head, not so much as examples of different literary and rhetorical forms — such as the short story, the epistle, the address, the lyric, etc. — as a more human analysis of each kind of writing in terms of spiritual values and intensity of experience. He appropriately, therefore, discusses the style of each class of writing with a view to showing how its characteristics — its simplicity, its directness, its concreteness — are part and parcel of the quality of thought. This difference is well emphasized by a comparison with the more abstract style of modern writing. The chapter on the history of the translation is an admirable one and should be very interesting to those who wish a simple statement of the facts. Even more impressive is the closing chapter. Prof. Gardiner makes out a most interesting case for the great influence that the translation has had on English style; and, though he perhaps exaggerates the debt that all succeeding writers owe to the great translator, Tindale, his treatment is in the interest of giving honor to whom honor is due. In general, it would be difficult to find in any semi-popular treatise on the subject of the Bible as literature a more interesting impression of the book — of the quality of its thought, the dignity of its manner, and the range of its influence.

Prof. Gardiner's treatment will be seen from the preceding account to consist in a well-judged exposition of the good, the great, and the impressive things in the Bible as a work of literature. That is the most necessary of all aims to-day in such study of the book as Prof. Gardiner has in view. Yet it is the task of criticism to point out one or two instances wherein his work is defective in aim. A young reader, turning to the Bible for the first time, might open to such a book as, say, the Chronicles, named by Prof. Brandes, and, as would probably be the case, not finding them interesting, might turn to Prof. Gardiner for guidance. Of such inferior parts Prof. Gardiner makes no mention; indeed, his book contemplates a wholly appreciative study of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nobler passages. Yet no study of any piece of literature of any author, of any body of writings, can pretend to completeness which does not take into account all the facts. To be sure, in final estimates, we sift the good from the bad, and a popular reading of any of the great masters of literature contents itself with what is best. We remember Wordsworth, Lamb, and Browning, for example, by their most original and significant work, and are right in not troubling ourselves with their inferior writings. The selective process is, humanly, inevitable. But a professed study of literature, a guide to reading, should not merely dwell on the greatness of its theme.

As a matter of fact, those of us who read the Bible, even with the most devout spirit, are conscious of the fact that the Bible is, as a whole, an extremely uneven book. There are many parts which children ought not to read. Guiding is to some degree moral discrimination, and though one would wish inferior work to be passed over as summarily as possible, it is perhaps a mistake for Prof. Gardiner to dwell so exclusively on excellencies. The only shortcoming in the Bible as literature that one finds in his treatment lies in the fact that, unlike modern literature, the Bible contains little abstract thought, and even this limitation is turned into praise for the greater simplicity and vividness of the Scriptures. The attitude is in general like that of Coleridge, Lamb, Hazlitt, and Cowden Clarke toward Shakespeare, in whom they were content to see no variableness, neither shadow of turning.

The trouble, if trouble it be, goes back to a statement of Prof. Gardiner's preface:

> In all my discussion I have assumed the fact of inspiration, but without attempting to define it or to distinguish between religious and literary inspiration. The two come together in a broad region where every one who cares for a delimitation must run his line for himself.

Setting aside the fact that, except as regards so-called verbal inspiration, not even psychologists are competent to tell us what inspiration is, much less to delimit the various forms of inspiration, the assumption seems to me to be both an unnecessary and an embarrassing one. It is unnecessary in dealing with a literary subject, because the student is to do simply with the body of facts as he has them presented to him — in their variety, their impressiveness, their vitality — to get what enjoyment and stimulus he may from them. These facts would be the same, Prof. Gardiner's analysis of them would be the same, so long as he is the scrupulous and reverent critic that he is, whether the facts were inspired or not; for the question is one of literature and not of divine origins. Why complicate the question in this wise? We do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not assume inspiration of any sort in our ordinary literary studies, in dealing with Shakespeare or Shelley, for example; but, if we use the term, it is as an after-thought, to express our admiration for the extreme opposite of what we find dull. The assumption is embarrassing in that it compels one even to force himself to pronounce everything good, and to eschew its opposite or to deny the existence of inferiority.

In consequence of this, possibly, Prof. Gardiner is occasionally led to press his conclusions further than his facts will warrant. For example, it is indisputable that the English translation has had an extraordinary effect on the history of English style; and it is not too much, in view of that, to call Tindale, as Prof. Gardiner did in a former article, "the Father of English prose." But it is somewhat extravagant to say "that if any writing departs very far in any way from the characteristics of the English Bible it is not good English writing." Regularity, precision, balance, cadence, and, indeed, many other virtues of prose existed in languages written by men who walked in darkness, and to some of these Greeks and Romans the debt of many English writers is as great as to the Bible. One cannot see, without more evidence than Prof. Gardiner gives, how the Bible has materially affected the writing of, say, Swift, or Johnson, or Arnold, all professed believers in the excellence of the Book, to say nothing of such professed scoffers as Gibbon. And it is rather uncritical to say that "Lincoln, not only among Americans, but among all English-speaking people of the nineteenth century, is the man who most surely attained the grand style, and we all know how naturally in his most solemn moments his style became infused with the phrases and the virtues of the English Bible." The main idea is a sound one, but it gains nothing from being pushed to extremities.

The second purpose of such books — how to make readers interested in literature of the highest moment — is not touched by Prof. Gardiner; indeed, it was not his purpose to do so. That is the burden of Prof. Bates's latest book[1] on education. How to read the classics, the English classics, those books that Prof. Brandes found not "good for every one," is really the complicated question that he tries to answer. Originally delivered as a series of lectures at the summer school of the University of Illinois, his talks inevitably retain some of the unction and repetitiousness of popular discourse; but the gist of the matter is not hard to get at, and it is illuminated by a rich and thoughtful experience. The desideratum is the inculcation in the youthful mind of a real liking for literature. The means, in the last analysis, is the teacher who

[1] Arlo Bates: "Talks on Teaching Literature." Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can make literature appear of vital rather than detached interest to the reader. The teacher must feel his subject, literature, and not simply talk about it. Many of the subjects frequently exploited at great length in teaching do not contribute to the end. Biographical matter is usually too copious — for the reason that it is the easiest thing to talk about; — teachers do not make pupils think for themselves, but often do the work for them; preaching palpable morals, a tempting and easy thing to do, is bad; the pupil should not be warned to find excellence, lest he learn to cant; he should not be given questionable books, such as Macaulay's essay on Milton, for the reason that his mind becomes obsessed with Macaulay's untenable dogmas; juvenile literature is usually bad;—such are some of the drawbacks that Prof. Bates finds in the modern methods, and his remarks surely appeal to one's reason. The wise course, on the contrary, is first to make the pupil understand what he is reading, — to which end a special study of vocabulary and reading aloud are excellent means — and then to lead him to connect this with his own experience. The main thesis is not wholly new; it agrees, for example, with that of Prof. Brandes already cited; but the virtue of Prof. Bates is that his remarks and experiences are always copious and illuminating.

As such the book should be read by every teacher, if for no other reason than the fresh and invigorating common-sense with which Prof. Bates approaches his subject. It is not an easy book, however; he who runs, as many teachers are forced to do, may not always read. If anything, there is an *embarras de richesses;* Prof. Bates has so much to say that he occasionally is under the necessity of making factitious categories in order to compass material for which there was no room in the more real divisions of his subject. For example, it is hard to distinguish, either in definition or illustration, the difference between such classes (which name separate chapters) as "The Problem" and "The Conditions," or "The Inspirational Use of Literature" and "Educational." And occasionally Prof. Bates's earnestness leads him to fall into a mild fremescence of style not good for clearness. But mainly the book is excellent, and its quality may to some degree be judged from such valuable advice as is contained in the following isolated passages.

> A sensitiveness to word-values is with a child the beginning of wisdom. Children too often acquire, and adults follow, the habit of accepting words instead of ideas. — . . . Children need to learn that the sentence is after all only the envelope, only the vehicle, for the thought. Everybody agrees to this theoretically but practically the fact is ignored. The child is father to the man in nothing else more surely than in the trait of accepting in perfect good faith empty words as complete and satisfactory in themselves (p. 14).
>
> What should be done in the lower grades, and usually all that can with profit be attempted in the secondary schools anywhere, is to cultivate in the children a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

love of literature and some appreciation of it: appreciation intelligent, I mean, but not analytic. I would have the secondary schools do little with the history of authors, less with the criticism of style, and have no more explanation of difficulties of language and of structure than is necessary for the student's enjoyment (p. 30).

By way of making things worse, scholars are drilled in Macaulay's "Milton." The inclusion of this essay, the product of the author's 'prentice hand, is most lamentable. The philistinism of Macaulay is here rampart; and the one thing which students are sure to get from the essay is the conception that poetry is the product of barbarism, to be outgrown and cast aside when civilization is sufficiently advanced (p. 35).

I am far from being so modern as to think that pupils should not be asked to do anything which they do not wish to do; but I am radical enough to believe that no other good which may be accomplished by the study of literature in any other way can compensate for making good books wearisome (p. 53).

The tendency to abuse children with morals is as vicious as it is widespread (p. 72).

Not one teacher in a score had succeeded [a fact is related] in impressing upon his pupils the fundamental truth that the only excuse that poetry can have for existing is that it fulfils an office impossible for prose. Yet nothing which can properly be called the study of poetry can be done till this prime fact is recognized with entire clearness (p. 214).

Prof. Bates's book is addressed to those with beginners in their charge, and it concerns itself largely with the aims and methods of such instruction. The aims of the higher study of English rather than the methods is the purport of Prof. Cook's recent treatise,[1] and it addresses itself rather to the advanced and eager student than to the established teacher. The main thesis is somewhat difficult to state — for two reasons: Prof. Cook's book consists of four separate essays or addresses — "The Province of English Philology," "The Teaching of English," "The Relations of Words to Literature," and "Aims of Graduate Study of English" — written at different times during the last decade and delivered or published on various occasions; and, in the second place, Prof. Cook is so enthusiastic a believer in the ideals of his profession that to reduce his messages to cut and dried exactness is to lose the great persuasiveness of manner which is at least half their value. Presented as a single train of thought, the idea is, however, something as follows:

Since the abdication of clergymen from their high office of leading the way to what is permanently good, and in view of the failure of poets nowadays to appeal vitally to man, the teacher has become the most important of guides in the conflict of spirit with matter. He must be in the highest degree human and scholarly, if he is to use present forces of modern life for the most ideal ends. English literature is the best

[1] A. S. Cook: "The Higher Study of English." Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

means now at his disposal for accomplishing his mission, and he must be a philologist in the true sense of the term; he must "endeavor to relive the life of the past; to enter by the imagination into the spiritual experiences of all the historic protagonists of civilization in a given period and era of culture; to think the thoughts, to feel the emotions, to partake the aspirations, recorded in literature; to become one with humanity in the struggles of a given nation or race to perceive and attain the ideal of existence; and then to judge rightly these various disclosures of the human spirit, and to reveal to the world their true significance and relative importance." His study, as Prof. Cook illustrates the matter in his address on the relation of words to literature, should be characterized by fulness as well as by intensity. There is good reason, Prof. Cook says in his essay on the teaching of English, for believing that the ideal may come to pass; for out of the past chaos in English studies and the present tendency to lay stress on quantity rather than quality, there are signs that "scholarship in English, through the agency of our better graduate schools, is deepening as well as widening, is growing more refined and less mechanical. There is hope that the quantitative test will be gradually supplanted by the qualitative — that we shall forget to ask, 'How much?' and begin to ask, 'How well?'"

Were it not for such hope and such ideals as this, a reader might wish that Prof. Cook had dealt more extensively with actual conditions as the best means of approach to his ideals. His high enthusiasm occasionally leads him to take a less strict account of what is than the most helpful attitude would call for. For example, in the last piece, he raises the qualifications of the well-equipped teacher to an impossible height, and, though he admits that the ideal is never attained, he would be more helpful if he gave some relative standing to the twelve attributes which no well-equipped teacher can be without. Is it more important, for example, that he teacher must "speak and write the language with propriety," or that "he should be a gentleman, and, if convenient, a good fellow, in the better sense of that term"? Again, Prof. Cook does not squarely answer Prof. (now President) Wilson's urbane strictures on the methods of much modern investigation, but says, in essence, that philology is the beautiful thing described in the foregoing paragraphs; whereas Prof. Wilson's quarrel was not with the ideal denotation of the term philology, but with its practical applications and the sins committed in its name. It is, of course, no answer to Prof. Wilson to say that certain great poets and orators have also studied the etymology and grammar, or have written treatises on those subjects. But as the presentation of an ideal the book could scarcely be surpassed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The books which I have mentioned represent three fairly distinct types: Mr. Larned, Prof. Brandes, and Prof. Cook, stand for more or less general points of view, not always in mutual agreement; Prof. Gardiner presents special material, and Prof. Bates considers the question of ways and means. Though these books are for the most part based on a broad common-sense and a keen observation, the ultimate sanctions of them all are personal rather than objective and scientific. Still another type, therefore, of guides to culture would comprise treatises which deal with the matter in terms of actual science, such as anthropology and psychology, in that they tell us how far natural limitations embarrass the inculcation of wisdom. Examples among very recent books are those of Prof. Horne[1] and Prof. O'Shea.[2] Again, that culture is more than reading is the implication of several books on art and music, which tell us how to see and to hear. Nor can more general books be neglected, which try to make us think rightly on momentous subjects. Such are President Eliot's sober and substantial exposition of the value of wealth,[3] a book at once sensible and moral — though disfigured by an occasional impossible comparison, like that between the relative happiness of the millionaire of fifty and the newly married mechanic of twenty-five — and Prof. Matthews's [4] and Prof. Wendell's [5] generous analyses of the American character. All these and more might properly be brought under this head of cultural books.

The books which I have chosen from recent announcements as those which best come under the subject, have one thing in common. Almost without exception — the fact was not noted until the moment of writing — they have sprung from the universities. The fact is probably merely accidental; but it suggests that the universities are still the chief popular guides to culture.

WILLIAM T. BREWSTER.

[1] H. H. Horne: "The Psychological Principles of Education." The Macmillan Company, 1906.

[2] M. V. O'Shea: "Dynamic Factors in Education." The Macmillan Company, 1906.

[3] C. W. Eliot: "Great Riches." T. Y. Crowell, 1906.

[4] Brander Matthews: "American Character." T. Y. Crowell, 1906.

[5] Barrett Wendell: "Liberty, Union and Democracy." Scribner's, 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DRAMA.

AMERICAN drama in the making is the absorbing spectacle offered in sum by Greater New York's seventy-five theatres and their provincial ramifications, at the present moment. The activity is prodigious, unprecedented; the results are strikingly interesting, full of promise and significance.

Preparations for the new season were already far advanced before the old season came to its end, in May last. Some of the first-class houses, notably the Lyceum, with Charles Klein's enormously successful native comedy, "The Lion and the Mouse," did not close at all, but braved the dead sultriness of the dog-days and the seasonable competition of the roof gardens, and found reward in the continuous patronage of that transient summer army of visitors which annually invades this metropolis when the New Yorkers temporarily evacuate. Belasco's "Girl of the Golden West" took only four weeks' vacation; "The Social Whirl," at the Casino, never flagged; while the sprightly and tuneful "Little Cherub" began its deservedly long and happy career at the Criterion about the middle of August. On or before Labor Day a majority of the playhouses, including the Hippodrome, had opened their doors; and by the middle of September all of them, with the addition of the new Astor Theatre, were in full career. In October, the Lincoln Theatre was added to the list of metropolitan playhouses, and marked Sixty-sixth street as the northern outpost of that extension of Broadway's "Rialto" which ten years ago had barely reached Long Acre Square. In December, Oscar Hammerstein's Manhattan Opera House inaugurated its first campaign, in full rivalry with the Metropolitan Opera, under Heinrich Conried; these two vast enterprises, supplemented by Henry Savage's original American production of Puccini's "Madam Butterfly," constituting what will go down in musical history as "New York's million-dollar opera season."

In so far as it is a question merely of quantity, of numbers, of material magnitude and splendor, New York stands to-day the foremost theatrical city in the world. That its artistic rating is proportionately far lower is now an obvious, trite, and also somewhat pharisaical remark. But, as we have said, this is American drama in the making. The tremendous evolutionary process is steadily going on, and indica-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions are not altogether lacking that we have commenced to build in the spirit of the older nations, whose work is "not for an age, but for all time."

But New York, rapidly as it has grown, has not been able to keep pace with the enormous native theatrical development of the times. Only three years ago, this city represented the general headquarters and producing centre, and the other cities were nowhere. There was but one Theatrical Syndicate, and its seemingly impregnable stronghold was here. To-day there are two syndicates of the first magnitude, between whose rivalries and competitions independent managers all over the country are beginning to get their long-sought opportunities.

Though the season as yet is scarcely half over, there have been already produced *outside* of New York as many important dramas as, until recently, a whole winter was wont to bring forth in this luxurious and dominating metropolis itself. Chicago, besides possessing a New Theatre of its own which in the first month's bills had such attractions to offer as Rex Beach's "The Spoilers" and a one-act piece by George Ade, has seen the premières of William Vaughn Moody's "Great Divide," Mansfield's version of Ibsen's "Peer Gynt," Gen. Lew Wallace's "Prince of India," George Cohan's "Popularity," Mrs. Fiske in Langdon Mitchell's "New York Idea," Edward Peple's "Love Route," and Jesse Lynch Williams's "Stolen Story," while having in prospect, among other things, the first representation on the American stage, by the Sothern-Marlowe Company, of D'Annunzio's "Daughter of Jorio." This latter company, foremost among our legitimate travelling organizations, opened its season in Philadelphia with the first performance on any stage of Percy MacKaye's original poetic drama of "Jeanne d'Arc," following with Sudermann's "Johannes" (John the Baptist), and a revival of Charles Henry Meltzer's translation of Hauptmann's "Sunken Bell."

Boston was the capital chosen for the preliminary trials of such notable pieces as Charles Klein's "Daughters of Men," David Belasco's "Rose of the Rancho," and Wright Lorimer's ambitious essay in an Ibsen play hitherto unfamiliar on our stage — "The Wild Duck." Detroit was the theatrical birthplace of "The House of Mirth," Trenton of "The Jungle," and Cleveland of Clyde Fitch's latest drama, "Truth." Washington, Baltimore, Indianapolis, Pittsburg, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Minneapolis, and even Atlantic City, N. J., Buffalo, Albany, Syracuse and Rochester, N. Y., Springfield, Mass., and New Haven, Conn., are coming into such increased managerial favor for serious "initial presentations" that they are no longer classified under the undignified appellation of "dog towns." Then there is Brooklyn, which, though

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theatrically further removed from Manhattan than any of the other large cities named, has the Spooner Stock Company and Corse Payton's, with repertoires, clientèle, revivals, and new productions all their own, and is a sort of suburban world in itself.

It is still in a measure true, though not by any means so comprehensive a matter of fact as it used to be, that the plays and productions above mentioned, and all others in their category, must sooner or later come to Broadway, New York City, for their final judgment and reward — to be "boomed" and booked, or buried. In that sense, they need not have been thus detached from the regular budget of the New York season, here to be enumerated. The fact, however, of so many new works of such calibre being "tried out" in localities not hitherto regarded as possible "producing centres" seemed sufficiently striking to call for special note.

What, then, are the established New York successes, vintage of 1906, up to the present? Safe to be so characterized are: "The Hypocrites," "His House in Order," "The Great Divide," "Cæsar and Cleopatra," "The Prince of India," "The Rose of the Rancho," "The New York Idea," "The Chorus Lady," "Clothes," "The Three of Us," "The Love Route," "Daughters of Men," "The Man of the Hour," "The Rich Mr. Hoggenheimer," "The Red Mill," "The Little Cherub," and "A Spring Chicken" — the last four named being farces, of more or less musical persuasion.

The unequivocal failures, at least so far as New York is concerned, seem to include: "The House of Mirth" "Mizpah," "Barbara's Millions," "The Stolen Story," "Man and his Angel," "Lady Jim," "John Hudson's Wife," "The Measure of a Man," "Brigadier Gerard," "The Dear Unfair Sex," and "Sam Houston." These seem heavy tithes to pay, yet it is all in the business of a big season's drama.

Between these two poles of success and failure hang suspended a score or more of new plays, some of them the work of our foremost dramatists, and most of them the latest vehicles of established stars, demanding critical appreciation. Before briefly reviewing these, however, or the Shakespearean, legitimate and poetic, revivals, it may be profitable to linger a moment and consider in conjunction those two remarkable twentieth-century American dramas, "The Great Divide" and "The House of Mirth" — the former a wellnigh unaccountable hit; the latter a somewhat surprising and unexpected fiasco.

"The Great Divide," by William Vaughn Moody, is the virile but crude and essentially unpoetic work of a writer justly esteemed and hitherto known only as a lyric poet of fine and sincere feeling. On its first presentation in New York, it puzzled yet impressed the critics,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and they gave it the benefit of the doubt they must have vaguely felt, by hailing it with unwonted accord and unguarded enthusiasm as a formidable competitor for that meaningless title of something which in the nature of things can hardly be — "the Great American Play." The question of its greatness is at least debatable; and its Americanism is more an external matter of locale than of anything inherently native in its chief incidents, or in the character and motives of Stephen Ghent and Ruth Jordan, whose mutual heart-struggle begins in Arizona and ends in Massachusetts.

What is truly, egregiously American about "The Great Divide," as a rudimentary analysis of the piece will show plainly enough, is its author's lack of courage in his artistic convictions. After making a bold, even an audacious, beginning, he weakens logically before the first curtain is reached, in order to conciliate the average polite and proper Anglo-Saxon audience — or, as is more likely, the cautious and commercial New York manager. As the action progresses, its motives become more and more involved in a tangle of inconsistencies, culminating in a deplorable example of the conventional "everybody happy" ending.

Mr. Moody originally called his play "The Sabine Woman," a truly significant title, only too literally suggestive of the theme chosen by the dramatist. Ruth Jordan, a heroine with a New-England conscience and a frankly acknowledged predilection for an "unfinished" husband, a man "in the rough," such as the primeval feminine in her has loved "for æons past," is suddenly confronted with just such a person. Accompanied by two other ruffians even more drunken and brutal than himself, he breaks into the isolated ranch-house in the Gila Desert where Ruth has been left alone, and intimidates her by force. After shooting one of his fellow-marauders and buying off the other, he secures the girl for himself, by assenting to her own proposition that they go straightway to the nearest magistrate and become wedded man and wife.

The next we see of them, they are living unhappily together in the Catalina Mountains, where "Steve" has struck gold. He is fondly planning their future; she is spurning his affection and wealth alike, and secretly selling basket-work, in order to pay back the price in gold nuggets with which, as she declares, he "bought her, like an Indian squaw." Remembering what transpired in the end of the preceding act, there is no reason at all why she should behave in this self-contradictory manner, except that it prepares the way for a really effective dramatic touch in the scene immediately ensuing, when her horrified relatives come on from the East, and she assumes the wifely loyalty which she has not, so as to scout their extremely disparaging opinions of her husband, and to defend him for the sake of her own pride.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But this only brings the play to the middle of the second act. Another violent wrench must be given to probabilities, more tortures devised for Ruth's acutely introspective conscience, new excuses given her for weeping and lying, and business made for a third and final act. So she suddenly changes her mind again and decides to quit Steve forever, and go back home with her brother Phil to Massachusetts—this at the very moment when she has just been at the pains of explicitly telling her husband, and the audience, that for the best of family reasons she ought to remain where she is! One might well imagine that such intimate confidences from a woman on the stage of a theatre would shock, or at least uncomfortably embarrass, the gentle play-going public. But, bless you! since "Man and Superman," "The Hypocrites," and "The Shulamite," to say nothing of "Hedda Gabler," we have learned to take these things lightly, and to hear the declamatory or epigrammatical discussion of things sacred, with the *sang froid* of medical students at a clinical lecture.

Later on, in Act III, Stephen Ghent surreptitiously follows Ruth to her mother's home at Milford Corners, Mass. Notwithstanding the little or no encouragement he has met with, married life seems to have transformed him from a picturesque brute to a commonplace man. He yearns to see the baby son that has been born, and that is said to receive little more of its mother's affection than does the father himself. Ruth at first is as fiercely uncompromising as ever, then she softens somewhat. She does not gain upon our sympathies, however, nor does Steve, when he drops the air of penitent, suffering forbearance and patient self-control that had almost reconciled us to him, and becomes feebly and coarsely jocose in talking about "the angels working overtime" on his case. When Ruth does fall into his arms, at the last curtain, it is difficult logically to avoid the reflection that, inasmuch as her change of heart followed closely upon the announcement that he had paid off the mortgage on mother's dear old home, she might in the near future bring up the still unsettled question of her having been "bought like an Indian squaw," and insist upon threshing it all over again.

The intelligent and enthusiastic work of Henry Miller and Margaret Anglin, who acted respectively the rôles of Stephen Ghent and Ruth Jordan, had everything to do with the decisive success of "The Great Divide," on its first presentation here. Its scenic investiture at the Princess Theatre also supplied a certain poetic, imaginative element in which the drama itself is deficient. Yet the work as a whole is probably not unworthy of the extraordinary attention it has attracted. It portrays a set of life-like and well-contrasted characters, so played against one another that, despite the unskilfulness of the inexperienced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

author, they occasionally strike genuine dramatic fire in the development of a nobly chosen theme—the uplifting of a man from his lowest estate to his highest by the sheer power of earthly love.

"The House of Mirth" was dramatized by Clyde Fitch from Mrs. Edith Wharton's widely celebrated novel of life among New York's so-called smart social set. The short and inglorious history of this theatrical venture is highly instructive as to the influences which still dominate our stage. Every thoughtful reader knows, and must have felt from the beginning, that "The House of Mirth" is nothing more or less than a bit of literary artistry, as white and smooth — and as bloodless — as one of Canova's groups of marble statuary. Mrs. Wharton, indisputably, is familiar with her social *monde;* but her regard for the fellow-beings who people it is merely Platonic. What she really loves is exquisite writing, for its own sake, after the style of Henry James. The consequence is, that when she undertakes to depict the futile struggle of Lily Bart against the society of wealth and fashion, for the sake of antithesis she makes the latter one solid background of heartless vulgarity, sordid ostentation, brutal cynicism and caddishness, unrelieved by a single gleam of sentiment, geniality, Christian kindness, or even the natural refinement of good taste. Not even Mrs. Wharton can make us believe it possible for wealth and position to have recruited such a company of degenerates under one roof for a week-end house party at the Gus Trenors' country place.

Sympathy for Miss Bart is demanded, on the plea that she is beautiful, charming, clever, good, unfortunate, and helpless. Yet, throughout the whole book, from her preposterous visit to Lawrence Selden's bachelor apartments, in the first chapter, to her death from an overdose of chloral in the last, she never shows a winning trait or any sign of distinction, never says a witty thing or does a wise one, nor conducts herself in a way that right judgment could approve or common sense commend.

These fatal shortcomings, from the point of view of a possible dramatic representation, are almost as apparent in the novel as they subsequently became in the play. Why, then, the dramatization? The answer is painfully simple: "The House of Mirth" was the most powerfully "backed," the most extravagantly advertised, the most unconscionably puffed, and as a consequence the best selling, novel of the year. Could anything more be required to stir up the enterprising manager whose motto is: "Give the public what it wants"?

Mr. Fitch did what he could in the way of supplying "bright lines" for Mrs. Wharton's marionettes. He prompted Lily Bart to say for herself: "My mother had no money for me, but she gave me expensive

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tastes instead." When Mrs. "Gus" Trenor reproaches one of her admirers for "talking to her like a husband," the flippant youth replies, "How can you say such cruel things to me?"

But when such a creative and subtle actress as Fay Davis, who took the part of the heroine, tried to strengthen it by putting in some of the hysterics necessary to account for what action there is, poor Lily proved too weak to stand the strain, and the whole artificial fabric fell to pieces. After all, the fundamental laws underlying true dramatic art are their own Nemesis.

"His House in Order," the latest Pinero play, has in Hilary Jesson, a genial bachelor-philosopher of the British foreign diplomatic service, one of those delightful John Drew parts which fit that gentlemanly actor as faultlessly as do his clothes. It is, moreover, a vital comedy of modern life, as middle-class Englishmen live it, carried out unflinchingly to a rising climax, which, whether on a plane with ordinary human conduct or decidedly transcending it, makes this one of the best plays of the season. The crisis at which the intervention of Uncle Hilary achieves its good work is where Nina, the second wife of a prig who is finical about his household arrangements and personal comfort, is sacrificed by him and his family to the memory of her predecessor, the late sainted Annabel. But Nina accidentally gets hold of a packet of old letters, proving beyond a doubt that Annabel was a faithless wife, and had planned an elopement with her lover on the very day that she met her death by a carriage accident. Hilary persuades her to an almost superhuman act of renunciation, in giving up to him those fatal letters, without using them to confound her persecutors. Then, after the enthusiasm aroused by this act subsides, he tranquilly turns about, produces the compromising documents, and tells the husband all. Thus is poetic justice accomplished, and a masterly exemplification given of what duty is, according to the definition of the late Alexandre Dumas, *fils:* "What is duty? It is that which we exact of others."

"The Hypocrites," by Henry Arthur Jones, is another earnest comedy-drama of English life to-day, but so accurately gauged to the normal *tempo* of human heartbeats that it becomes, if not universal, at least broadly Anglo-Saxon. Mr. Jones staked his well-established reputation, built upon such substantial achievements as "Mrs. Dane's Defence," "Joseph Entangled," and a dozen other repertoire successes, on this same breadth of appeal, by bringing "The Hypocrites" to New York for its first production on any stage. His confidence in his work, and in his American following, proved to be amply justified. Yet there is nothing new, original, or experimental either in his ingredients or in the formula he uses for their blending.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The play is dedicated to that safe general indictment, which everybody tacitly assents to, and nobody either cordially disputes or sincerely believes, that society is an organized hypocrisy. The play's specific motto, or text, is: "Expediency is man's wisdom: doing right is God's." The burden of the right-doing falls upon a poor but staunch young curate. The expediency, which, of course, is but another name for various kinds of hypocrisy, is practised by all the other personages of a rural parish, including the vicar, who typifies "good living" in the gastronomical sense. Between these two conflicting elements, the long-suffering heroine, a pale young person dressed in black, who has been wooed and deserted by the son of the lord of the manor in order that he may become affianced to the baronet's daughter, meets with those unpleasant and only too familiar emotional experiences which make the play and assure its coming out all right in the end. We seem to have met all these people, somewhere, and under similar circumstances, before. Was it in real life, or in numerous "heart interest" domestic dramas as far back as we can remember? No matter, so long as they stir our pulses with the wholesome excitement of a righteous row. Needless to say, this result nowadays requires for its accomplishment some sound philosophy, worldly tact, and, above all, a careful technique.

Charles Klein, who has followed up his phenomenally successful "Lion and Mouse" with another equally promising dramatic tract, "The Daughters of Men," possesses certain qualities which liken him to his British contemporary, Henry Arthur Jones. Both are conservative socialists, fully abreast with the times, and technically skilful enough to dramatize them effectively. Neither indulges in imagination or poetry, though honest sentiment, and even sentimentality, may be occasionally in their line. Mr. Jones makes a specialty of moral and ethical problems; Mr. Klein, of political and economic posers. In this, are they not as truly representative of our material age as were Shakespeare and Marlowe of the romance-days of feudalism?

"The Daughters of Men" has been criticised as "irregular," according to the standards of some plays that have failed, and as "a compromise" for timely vogue because of its unequivocal success in arousing interest, not to say enthusiasm, in the discussion of vital issues hitherto found too heavy — or too heavily treated — for the theatre. We hear the objection made that our dramatist does not solve the great social problem of modern times, as to the mutual relationship of Labor and Capital. Despite the vivid, pulsating presentment of these opposed elemental forces in a live twentieth-century comedy, the eternal conflict still goes on. All that Mr. Klein does is to show us plainly how and where the clash comes, and then suggest, by apposite illustration, how "a little

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentiment, a little compromise" — in short, a reciprocal spirit of brotherly love and Christian charity — in the conduct of business affairs might charm away some portentous evils, and appreciably add to the sum of human happiness.

Is it not something large, to have placed such a "preachment" as this acceptably before the vast theatre-going public of the world's commercial metropolis? The tragedy of "Hamlet" shows us that "there's something rotten in Denmark," and how "the times are out of joint" generally. We are deeply moved, perhaps started a-thinking, by the recital, and that suffices, without our demanding there and then that the unhappy Prince be made to set everything right. Much the same kind of stimulation ought to be conveyed to the impartial audiences who nightly gather at the Astor Theatre — a playhouse which, with its simple and classic interior architecture, patterned after that of the ancient Athenian theatre of Dionysus, is in itself a lesson and a delight — to see set forth in contrasted types of modern men and women, all new to the theatre, the working of those all-absorbing ideas which, whether we will or no, underly the whole fabric of our actual everyday life.

The conservative financier of the gentlemanly "old school;" the smooth, incisive, imperious young company-directors, who have "nothing to arbitrate;" the prodigal son who has married an actress and insists upon his right to do as he likes with his own inherited money; the mixed-up representatives of labor, classified by one of themselves as "the skilled ones, who know how to work, the unskilled ones who don't, and then all the others who don't want to work;" the blatant demagogues and anarchists, who want to tear things to pieces, and the level-headed council officers of the unions who strive heroically to keep them together — all these are drawn with unmistakable verisimilitude, and, if a trifle broad in characterization, are still well within the bounds of stage license.

Twin protagonists of the whole scheme are the two women, admirable antitheses of femininity — a daughter of the rich, portrayed with sympathetic beauty and distinction by Effie Shannon, and a daughter of the people, done to the very life, with superb ebullition of animal spirits and impulsive womanliness of heart, by Dorothy Donnelly. These two meet on the common plane of being in love with the same man — the young college-bred labor socialist, whom Orrin Johnson makes plausible and likable in spite of some declamatory drawbacks. They fight it out on this line, and, hearts and courage being evenly matched, good breeding and self-restraint fairly win. This feminine battle brings on what looks at first like the conventional situation of the concealed lady, or ladies, in the hero's apartment at an unseemly hour. But, by a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

novel and ingenious turn, here suddenly develops the real and logical climax of the action, in the bringing together of the magnates of money and the leaders of labor so that they can sit down together and talk over their differences — not as they actually do in real life, but as every reasonable human being devoutly wishes they might.

Fortuitously in Horse Show week, Mrs. Fiske came to town with her brilliant new comedy, by Langdon Mitchell, bearing the too-restricted title of "The New York Idea." Unlike the equine paradox, this comedy will reign throughout the season, and other seasons to come. It deals with the "idea," the frivolous and irresponsible idea, unfortunately not confined to New York alone, of marriage and divorce on the progressive euchre plan. Such a serious subject cannot be dealt with too lightly on the stage. In other words, folly in its flight must be pierced, if at all, by the keen winged shafts of wit. Of these, Mr. Mitchell seems to have a full quiver. Fortunately, there is a saving grace of truth and tenderness behind it all, so that at the last, when the skittish Mrs. Cynthia Karslake comes back meek and gentle to the "sporty" husband whom she thought she had divorced, and figuratively eats out of his hand, one feels not so much that it is a happy ending, as that it is a right one.

"Nothing is final in nature, not even death," preaches the delectable worldly clergyman of the play; "and if death is not final, why should marriage be so?" All New York went to hear that sermon, and all New York came away happy — so he says. "The judiciary and the churches have mixed things up so, that we can't be sure we're married until we're divorced," Jack Karslake philosophizes. A fashionable marriage, to Cynthia's mind, has very much the aspect of a smart funeral; only that, happily, it isn't for so long. She rather inclines to think that "a woman should marry when she has the whim, and leave the rest to the man" — or to the divorce courts. But when the whim strikes twice in the same place, it is time to settle down to the inevitable. She returns to Karslake, her first whim; and that good fellow — who in the meantime has gone broke, while Cynthia is an heiress — declares that, after having "kicked the stuffing out of the matrimonial buggy," as a manifestation of her youthful thoroughbred spirit, she may now be trusted as a steady-goer, swift perhaps, but safe and kind.

If New York society persists in the insouciant error of its ways, after this season's theatrical expositions, it will be in spite of the fervent endeavors of many moral satirists to show up our frailties and indicate the austere pathway of reform. Among these well-meaning scourgers are Messrs. Avery Hopwood and Channing Pollock, who fitted that clever and winning comedienne, Grace George, with "Clothes." This play, as its title implies, undertakes to show what a tremendous influence over

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the lives of womankind is exerted by mere wearing apparel, and what it stands for. If a girl has wit and tact enough to keep this influence, or instinct, in its proper place, then her life story is a moderately successful comedy. If she "gives in," and weakly makes every compromise and sacrifice that comes along, then she is a tragic failure. There is the difference between "Clothes" and "The House of Mirth."

David Belasco has dived once more into that magic cabinet of his, and brought forth not only a fascinating new play, but also a magnetic young comedienne. "The Rose of the Rancho" is a light but well-knit story of California in the days succeeding "the splendid idle 'forties," when United States "hustle" rudely disturbed Spanish *dolce far niente*. The Spanish-American heroine, Senorita Juanita, is deliciously played by Frances Starr, a debutante as to parts of this importance, but an artistic personality who has won in a night a name and fame not to be lost sight of hereafter.

"The Dear Unfair Sex" proved too paltry a piece of work to sustain so refined and accomplished an actress as Ellis Jeffreys. William H. Crane, the most Yankee of American comedians, was sadly miscast as the poor but indifferent-honest literary Englishman in Alfred Sutro's disappointing latest offering, "The Price of Money"; but probably no cast could have sufficed to save so weak and vacillating a thing as this which the author of "The Walls of Jericho" and "The Fascinating Mr. Vandervelt" has permitted to go out under his marketable name. William Gillette's "Clarice," in which that popular actor-author this season stars himself with Marie Doro, is really a squandering of both abilities, though it may serve to attract that not inconsiderable section of the public who care for the player more than for the play. It is an unconvincing and somewhat morbid love-story, located in the mountain region of the Carolinas; and its most exciting moment is that in which the doctor-hero, having taken a suicidal dose of poison by way of a wholly unnecessary and absurd self-sacrifice, is saved by his rival in love and medicine by the administering of an antidote.

Virginia Harned, in "The Love-letter," a translation from Sardou in his later and most mechanical vein, made no marked impression; nor did Lena Ashwell, an English emotional actress of some distinction, win for her American presentation of the British-Boer play, "The Shulamite," more than the *succès d'estime* which it scored in London. George Cohan's "Popularity" did not live up to its title in New York, any more than did Nat Goodwin's abysmal descent into farce as "The Genius." May Irwin fell short of surpassing herself as "Mrs. Wilson," though she is still our most typical female humorist.

In "The Love Route," by Edward Peple, a vigorous, pleasing play

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Texas ranch and railroad life, Odette Tyler is making the most of an opportunity as good as that which she enjoyed in "Shenandoah." Carlotta Nillson is doing wonders for another neat little home-made play, "The Three of Us," all about mining speculations, in which she impersonates with unusual strength and finesse a courageous orphan girl burdened with many troubles, not the least of which is the awful name of Rhy Macchesney. James Forbes grasped a real triumph for himself and his "Chorus Lady" star, Rose Stahl, when he expanded the original vaudeville sketch into a four-act piece, the first half of which is racy and diverting enough to carry melodrama even more glaring than the latter part of this one.

Israel Zangwill has an easy knack of trifling with serious and unpromising themes, such as a surgical operation for a squint in the hero's eyes, in conjunction with a moral squint in his character; and when Eleanor Robson, as a nobleman's daughter playing at hospital work, lends her exquisite personality to the task of curing both of the obliquities aforementioned in her lover, the result is necessarily a dainty and agreeable "Nurse Marjorie." In pursuance of a commendable "repertoire" régime promised to endure throughout the season at the Liberty Theatre, Miss Robson soon followed the "Nurse" with "Susan in Search of a Husband," a Jerome K. Jerome storyette, and a one-act "Tenement Tragedy," neither of which calls for special comment at this date. Then came Clyde Fitch's mildly clever bit of comedy, "The Girl Who Has Everything." More interesting is the announcement that Miss Robson will presently appear in "The Lady of Dreams," which is a translation in verse, by Louis N. Parker, of Rostand's romantically beautiful "Princesse Lointaine," originally written for and played by Sarah Bernhardt.

The simultaneous presentation, early in the season, by two such noted actresses as Bertha Kalich and Blanche Walsh, of a lurid play called "The Kreutzer Sonata," might be taken, at a casual glance, to indicate a theatrical run upon the works of Tolstoy. As a matter of fact, it indicated nothing of the sort. The drama so named has no more to do with the writings of the eccentric Russian novelist than it has with Beethoven's music. It was written by Jacob Gordin, the pioneer and present head of New York's flourishing school of Yiddish playwrights, amongst which are numbered to-day such Hebrew celebrities as Boris Thomashefsky, Leon Kobrin, Joseph Litteiner, Sholem Aleichem, and others. These unpretentious authors, who supply dramas of contemporaneous human interest for the theatres of the half-million or more Jewish population of the East Side, think nothing of appropriating the titles, and oftentimes the text, of great masters like Shakespeare,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tolstoy, Ibsen, Gorky, or Dostoievsky, as a basis for their own original studies of Jewish life in Russia and America.

Gordin wrote "The Kreutzer Sonata" on this plan for Mme. Kalich some years ago, before she emerged from Grand street to become a luminary of the English-speaking stage. Meanwhile, Miss Walsh, having reaped laurels and profit from her stage version of "The Resurrection," sought to continue in the same line by acquiring the right to do "The Kreutzer Sonata" in English — a project which, as we have seen, coincided with that of Mme. Kalich.

Both actresses have done fairly well in the leading rôle of Miriam Friedlander, the courageous but unfortunate Jewish girl whose moving history begins with betrayal by an army officer in Russia, and ends with madness and murder in New York. Yet it is a question if they are not wasting their time and talents on such coarse, raw material. Gordin, it is true, is a dramatist of no mean power, in his way, and he has an Ibsen-like feeling for the inevitableness of tragic endings. The English adaptation of his play used by Mme. Kalich had the advantage of being revised by Langdon Mitchell, but this only put its fundamental crudities the more in evidence. It proved decidedly strong meat for Broadway amusement-seekers.

The comic history of "Cæsar and Cleopatra," in a sumptuous production at the New Amsterdam by Forbes Robertson and Gertrude Elliot, came as an agreeable surprise, and revealed its author, the irrepressible G. Bernard Shaw, in a more laudable light than anything of his previously presented here. It was written some years ago, for Mr. Robertson and his wife, but never saw the footlights until now. In the imperious Cæsar, Mr. Shaw found ready to his hand one of the most masterful and at the same time most prepossessing of human characters, so that he could not go very far wrong. Moreover, it diverted his mind temporarily from paradox, polemics, and immodesty, thus giving him unwonted range in the realm of pure comedy. There are moments of nobility, and even of poetry, in this unique work of imagination — as in the second scene of the first act, where Cæsar in the gloaming desert faces the mysterious Sphinx, and finds nestled to its stony breast the impulsive, kitten-like girl queen, Cleopatra; or, toward the end, where the world's conqueror, with the stoical reflection that "one who has not hoped can never despair," speaks a kindly word for Fate, and peers toward the future with the same half-wistful, half-ironical gayety as when looking into Cleopatra's eyes. It is indeed "almost human," which is more than can be said for Shaw plays as a general rule. Perhaps it might even have been questioned if this play really were written by the G. Bernard Shaw we used to know, but for his unmistakable sign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the recommendation to critics, conspicuously printed on the New Amsterdam Theatre programmes — that before criticising "Cæsar and Cleopatra" they shall read up "Manetho and the Egyptian Monuments, Herodotus, Diodorus, Strabo (Book 17), Plutarch, Pomponius Mela, Pliny, Tacitus, Appian of Alexandria, and perhaps Ammianus Marcellinus."

Poetic drama, of American authorship, came to the front early this season, with "Mizpah" and "The Prince of India." The first-named proved to be the Biblical story of Esther and King Ahasueras, done into facile Ella Wheeler Wilcox verse for the stellar exploitation of Elizabeth Kennedy and Charles Dalton. As a pompous stage spectacle, it did not wholly disappoint the audiences at the old Academy of Music; only, as they have been accustomed to pictorial melodrama of the most pronounced type, one could not help feeling that a comic villain or two would have helped out "Mizpah" wonderfully.

"The Prince of India," a massive verse-dramatization, by J. I. C. Clarke, of the historical novel of that name written by the late General Lew Wallace, was magnificently staged at the Broadway Theatre, apparently in the hope that it might prove another "Ben Hur." It is hardly that, though a very stirring and dazzling action-panorama of the fall of Christian Constantinople, with the legend of the Wandering Jew threaded through it. The scenery almost swamps the poetic drama, however, and in the marshalling of vast supernumerary legions — more than five hundred persons are on the stage at once, in some of the scenes — too little room for development is left such finely impersonated characters as Emmett Corrigan's "Prince" (the Wanderer), William Farnum's Mahommed the Conqueror, Boyd Putnam's Emperor Constantine, and Adelaide Keim's Princess Irene.

Neither Richard Mansfield nor Sothern and Marlowe have reached New York with their new and rich offerings, as this number of THE FORUM goes to press. But the verdicts of Philadelphia, Chicago, and Cincinnati have been pronounced in such strongly eulogistic terms that there is no likelihood of their being reversed; and we may look forward to a veritable dramatic festival with Mansfield in Ibsen's "Peer Gynt," E. H. Sothern in Suderman's "John the Baptist" and Hauptmann's "Sunken Bell," Julia Marlowe as Salome and Jeanne d'Arc, and Sothern and Marlowe together in such brand-new poetic or romantic plays as Henry Walcott Boynton's "Guenever," D'Annunzio's "Daughter of Jorio," and Mæterlinck's "Joyzelle"—all these in addition to their splendid Shakespearean repertoire. The author of "Jeanne d'Arc" is Percy MacKaye, son of the late Steele MacKaye, and the author of several published dramas in verse; while Mr. Boynton, who has in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Guenever" made an original version of the old Arthurian legend, is a well-known Boston littérateur. Mr. Sothern evidently believes in the existence of the American dramatist, and not "on paper" only.

The visit of Henry Brodribb Irving, younger son of the late Sir Henry Irving, revealed a young actor of marked distinction, who not only resembles physically his illustrious father, but has the ability to play some of his rôles, besides creating new ones of his own. His "Charles the First," especially, is a worthy perpetuation of the elder Irving's best traditions in the part. Stephen Phillips's "Paolo and Francesca," a one-act adaptation of Robert Louis Stevenson's "Markheim," and a translation of a French comedy by Mr. Irving himself, under the title of "Mauricette," were the novelties he brought. In the light, Parisian scenes of the last-named piece, Mr. Irving, and his wife, Dorothea Baird — a young actress of a delicate Pre-Raphaelite style of beauty, and elusive ingenue charm — together with their excellent all-round English supporting company, appeared to such advantage as to assure their hearty welcome on a promised return visit.

A splendid succession of Shakespearean revivals has bridged this first half of the theatrical season, with every prospect of well-sustained continuance. First came the opening of the Astor Theatre with "A Midsummer Night's Dream," Annie Russell an inimitable, Peter-Pan-like Puck, and John Bunny the best Bottom the present generation has seen. The Athenian costumes in this production were of academic correctness and taste, and the principal scenes produced a sense of æsthetic satisfaction quite in keeping with the lovely spoken lines.

This was followed, at the same house, by "Cymbeline," a play unfamiliar to the new generation of theatre-goers, though Imogen is generally regarded as one of the sweetest and most appealing of all Shakespeare's heroines. Viola Allen finds in this character scope for her best qualities as woman and actress. Joyousness and despair, the gentleness and courage of a pure heart, girlish ingenuousness, vivacity, and pensiveness contrasted with the flashing indignation and scorn of a high-bred nature under outrageous insult, or its pathetic calmness in despair — these, and the whole changing tumult of fleet emotions which crowd such masterpieces of the romantic drama, were all protrayed by Miss Allen and her well-selected company of players with an effect that remains memorable in a year of bounteous artistic yield.

Robert Mantell's ever-strengthening hold on the popular heart as a full-statured, legitimate, heroic, and tragic actor is a gratifying sign of the times. Reassuring, also, is William Crane's return to classic English comedy, in "She Stoops to Conquer." Opportunity of comparing the scholarly Hamlet of Forbes Robertson with the presentments of that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

immortal rôle by Sothern and Henry Irving may be afforded ere the winter is over. Ben Greet's Players, also, are touring this country again, and will come to Broadway with a repertoire expanded by "All's Well That Ends Well," the whole of "Hamlet" (unknown as such in these days of elaborate but time-consuming sets of scenery), and both parts of "Henry IV."

The cycle of Ibsen productions and revivals planned for New York and other principal American cities this season bid fair to surpass those of any European capital, with the possible exceptions of Christiania and Copenhagen. Besides Mansfield's epoch-marking "Peer Gynt," the list includes "Hedda Gabler" by Alla Nasimova, "The Wild Duck" by Wright Lorimer, "The Sea Lady" by Grace George, "Ghosts" and "Rosmersholm" by Mary Shaw, and perhaps the latter also by Bertha Kalich.

Alla Nasimova is the singularly attractive young Russian actress who, as "Mme. Nasimoff," played brilliantly the leading female parts in Paul Orleneff's all-Muscovite company last year. She has now learned English, and, with her racial subtlety expressed in beauty of person as well as through the most modern and progressive kind of stage training, will undoubtedly be welcomed as a timely acquisition to our theatre.

And what a play! what a character is Hedda, as thus lit from within by the baleful fires of an exotic genius! She is as poignant and unchangeable as Electra, as beauteous in fateful courage as Antigone, as overwhelming in tragic truth as Clytemnestra. Surely this creation of Ibsen, when fully interpreted and understood, must rank high above his merely fanciful, symbolistic, argumentative, or didactic dramas, and stand as a monument to his enduring fame. Hedda is fully accounted for as a perverse, morbid woman of the nineteenth century, the spoiled child of indulgence and self-will; but the whole dramaturgical conduct of the set of people and the circumstances in which she is placed is as sane, deliberate, inexorable, and overpoweringly impressive as the natural and divine laws of life and death. How she shines in moral dignity and true aristocratic pride by contrast with the craven and infamous Judge Brack, who basely covets her! She has vastly more firmness and self-control than the good but insipid Thea Elvsted; and, when it comes to the fatal crisis that only to a cowardly nature could mean anything else than death, she proves herself the possessor of a more exalted bravery than even the high-strung and desperate Eilert Lovborg, whom she could love only to destroy.

This intensely modern tragedy has drawn forth the deepest resources of two actresses so diverse in temperament and genius as Minnie Maddern Fiske and Alla Nasimova, with the identical result in both cases

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

— the fixing of "Hedda Gabler" as a record-mark of "furthest North" in the exploration of the human soul.

In the present rising tide of interest in the poetic drama, it was certain that the dormant question as to Browning would come up again. Why not play those things of his which were written for, or at, the dramatic stage? It is true, Macready tried that, contemporaneously, in London, at the cost of a flat failure or two. The late Lawrence Barrett gave a convincing demonstration, on this side of the Atlantic, of the utter unsuitability of "A Blot on the 'Scutcheon" to the purposes of acting. But a new and inexperienced generation has sprung up since then, and must be shown all over again. Four or five years ago, Mrs. Le Moyne, Otis Skinner, and Eleanor Robson combined their energies and skill on the one-act sketch, "In a Balcony," and, with the aid of scenery and music more exquisite than anything Browning had ever dreamed, got through it with appreciable artistic effect. Grace Elliston has made, and will repeat, a similar experiment as Mildred Tresham.

This season, under the energetic managerial guidance of Henry Miller, Mrs. LeMoyne bore the brunt of a thorough and admirable production of "Pippa Passes," in eight scenes, with special music setting by William Furst. She "doubled" the rôles of Ottima in Part I and Monsignor in Part II; while Mabel Taliaferro (the ingenuous Lovey Mary of "Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch") did the monologue of Pippa, William Beach officiated as Sebald, and several other ladies and gentlemen devoted conscientious efforts to a tangle of unyielding verbiage. The ambitious novelty of this entertainment drew to the Majestic Theatre a number of matinée audiences representative of New York's most literary playgoers. But what these audiences were regaled with was really a species of illustrated lecture, or elocutionary recital, rather than a play.

Browning conceives of Pippa not as a girl of flesh and blood, but as a symbol. She is a sort of impersonal vehicle, useful for carrying heavy burdens of philosophical bricks and mortar, which cannot be loaded upon real living dramatis personæ. He gives the poor child a soliloquy of over two hundred lines as soon as she awakens on the morning of her New Year's holiday. Her pretty lips, made for kisses, are forced to pronounce fifteen-minute speeches filled with jaw-breaking verses and ridiculous rhymes, such as:

> "Say not 'a small event!' Why 'small'?
> Costs it more pain that this, ye call
> A 'great event,' should come to pass,
> Than that? Untwine me from the mass
> Of deeds which make up life, one deed
> Power shall fall short in or exceed!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'Tis a case for the Gerry Society — especially when, instead of letting her enjoy the day rationally with the other girls of the silk mill, he causes her to trudge alone up the hillside, singing:

> "God's in his heaven,
> All's right with the world."

This cryptic utterance smites the ears of various unrelated groups of persons engaged in an assortment of crimes and villainies, proving that all's wrong in Asolo, as far as they can make it so. However, they are startled and set to thinking and talking to themselves à la Browning — and that is the whole "dramatical poem" of "Pippa Passes."

It must occur to the reader, in glancing over the large number and variety of dramatic doings recorded in these notes, that already we possess, in scattered and incoherent form, the main elements or impulses to be combined in the new national art theatre, the practical realization of which ambitious and altruistic project is yet an affair of the future. But American drama, to be to this country in the twentieth century what the Elizabethan drama was to England in the seventeenth, must go far afield from the latter's romantic, feudalistic, and exoteric teachings.

The rescue of the English-speaking stage from the control of commercial speculators and amusement syndicates is only preliminary to the great campaign of education necessary to compel its due recognition as a social force, and its permanent establishment on the basis of an art. "I would suggest," said Prof. G. P. Baker, of Harvard, at a meeting of the League for Political Education, held in the Hudson Theatre, New York, a few weeks since, "that the institutions in which our boys and girls are being trained should teach them that plays are plays, and not merely literature or poetry." Such an expression, from such a source, is the more significant in view of the fact that as professor of English literature at Harvard University, Prof. Baker has already taken a radical departure from such academic traditions as prevail at Oxford, for example, in giving his students a course of modern plays.

It was at Harvard, also, that Henry Arthur Jones, in his broad and stimulating lecture on "The Cornerstones of Modern Drama," in November just past, frankly expressed his doubt that his own plays would enjoy the welcome accorded them here, were national American drama already an accomplished fact. But if, as the author of "The Hypocrites" regretfully owns, there is a chance of our having a national theatre and a national drama while the English are still putting up with the futilities of French adaptations and the imbecilities of musical farce, in a larger sense all our modern Anglo-American drama is in the same boat. Its intellectual degradation and puny growth, as compared with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drama of France, during the past two hundred years, are the direct result of that Puritan wave of fanaticism which swept over England in the wake of the golden Elizabethan age. The holy horror of the theatre then implanted in the favoring soil of our naturally religious race is the real though impalpable obstacle which has stood in the way of either England or America developing an art of the drama at all worthy the dignity, the resources, and the self-respect of a great nation.

The "cornerstones," then, of a new and national drama pertinent to the spirit of our age and country are: 1, an enlarged conception of "literature," which shall recognize the living drama as its highest form; 2, the establishment of some sane and consistent notion of morality, so that the dramatic author shall not be rebuked for dealing sincerely with the paramount passions of humanity, while the covert indecencies and vulgarities of musical and farcical comedy are condoned and applauded; 3, the disentanglement of the drama from popular entertainment, *per se;* and, 4, the marking of reciprocal relations, as well as definite boundaries, between the art of the actor and that of the author.

It is hard, perhaps futile, to ask playgoers to take their theatre so seriously as all this. Indeed, it is not to them so much as to their would-be purveyors that Mr. Jones addresses his earnest and manly appeal. Still, it is eventually "up to" the playgoers to vote at the theatres as intelligently, and as patriotically, as they do at the polls. The playgoers are "the public," whose opinion is all-powerful. Actors and authors pass before their tribunal. They pass sentence upon the play, and from their judgment there is no appeal. They are supposed to hand out the reward of merit — if "sparingly with fees," at least "lavishly with laurels." So that, after all, even though the average hard-worked American may go to the playhouse to enjoy, he must remain to think — for it cannot possibly be a matter of indifference to him whether his nation's permanent record in the phonograph of history be spoken by a poet or by a clown.

HENRY TYRRELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INEXPENSIVE RECIPROCITY.

THAT policies should change as conditions do so, is the major premise of all sound reasoning concerning the problem of protection. Two new facts have transformed American industry in a way that affects this problem, and the first of these is the growth of monopolies. The selling of products at high prices at home and at lower ones abroad has become a general practice with the corporations that have command of our markets, and this single fact has everywhere raised a doubt as to the wisdom and justice of retaining the duties which make the practice possible. To the average mind it looks like taxing Americans in order to assist foreigners; and that corporations which are not too well loved should impose this tax adds an element of hostility to it. The people feel entitled to the benefit of what is called the "most favored nation clause," at least in their dealings with their own government, and they feel doubly entitled to it in dealing with the industries whose power and wealth they have themselves built up at a great and undoubted cost.

There is, indeed, an answer to the complaint of discrimination against our own people — the goods exported constitute an extra product, or an excess above what could otherwise be sold. After all has been made that will be taken in the home market, it is possible to manufacture more and sell it abroad — provided always that it is sold more cheaply.

Moreover, in the companies' book-keeping the goods exported, though they are identical with the others, cost much less, and it is made to appear that the manufacturers can continue forever to make articles for foreigners much more cheaply than it is possible to make them for Americans. With a mill in running order, but having a capacity for a larger output than it is making, it is only necessary to put new laborers into the force, buy more raw material, and do a little advertising through salesmen or otherwise, in order to make and sell the further output.

This part of the product is actually cheaper than the original part, if the book-keeping just described is valid; and from the producer's point of view it is valid. He is justified in reasoning thus:

"I am making a million cases of these goods for the American market, and the conditions here enable me to sell this amount at a profit, even though I charge against it all possible costs of manufacture. If I wish

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to make more and sell it elsewhere, there is no need of reckoning as a cost of this further and special output, any of those outlays which my American patrons are now defraying. How much will the extra production add to my present outlay? is the only question I have to ask; and it is clear that the addition will be small, and that if the foreigners will pay anything over and above this small cost I shall do well to sell to them. Moreover, there is nothing in this which will make me charge Americans any more than they are paying already. At present they bear the entire fixed cost of my business, and if I can gather in a penny or two from the foreigner above 'variable costs'—the additional outlay which the additional production involves — I shall not have to tax Americans any more heavily."

We may concede that a typical trust which enjoys a more or less complete monopoly in America will get in the home market what it now charges, in any case. The power which it has to crush competitors at home, and the protective duty which keeps the foreign producer from its American preserve, are together sufficient to insure this. The margin that it makes on its foreign sales puts something into its own pocket, but takes no additional tribute from the American consumer.

The claim, however, that this entire condition should be allowed to continue, is valid only on the supposition that the protective policy is so just and necessary that it must not be touched even though monopolies thrive by means of it. What the hard-headed American voter is beginning to see is that if the protective duty were not removed, but only somewhat reduced, the monopoly in its own market would be broken up. If prices became exorbitant the foreigner would interfere. He would sell his goods in America, not for less than it costs to make them here — for we should be certain to keep a sufficient duty to prevent that — but for less than the specially high price which a trust is now able to get.

The plan that is taking shape in many minds involves no abolition of the protective system. The general arguments in favor of that have too strong a hold on our people to be shaken, and it is not clear that they ought to be shaken. What is becoming perfectly clear is that there is a difference between a duty of a certain amount and one of a much greater amount. The one may do good and the other harm. One may introduce and foster an industry till it reaches independence — it may enable the "infant" to grow up; but the other may foster a monopoly within the industry, which is a very different matter. Overdoing protection in a way that is too obvious to be disclaimed — annulling by one part of our duties what we gain by the other — this is our present practice.

There is a definite part of the duty on an article made by a great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trust and sold at an exorbitant price which can be thrown off without wresting from the industry any profit that it has a right to. Its more extravagant profits, indeed, it will have to make over to the public that consumes its goods. It would have had to do this in any case if it had not crushed competition at home. Exposing it to the rivalry of foreigners, not on equal terms, but on terms which greatly favor it, would help to end its monopolistic charges but would leave it still in full possession of its present market so long as it should charge only what is fair. It could make ample returns and even thrive on the prices that would rule under a moderate duty. Demanding more is asking the people actually to legislate in favor of monopolies which would tax them in consequence of the legislation.

What is needed is that the American corporation should be exposed to the merely potential competition of the foreigner. Much actual competition he does not need to encounter. The mere fact that the foreigner *stands ready* to enter the territory whenever prices become exorbitant will prevent them from becoming so. As long as he stops short of such demands, the American producer can keep the foreigner out of his market; but if he makes the extortionate demand the foreigner steps in. This is a condition of fair dealing with the consuming public and of fair returns for the producer; and it is also a condition that insures technical progress in the methods of production.

With foreigners ready to compete with him unless he keeps his prices at a reasonable level, the producer must be alert in utilizing new machinery as it appears. He must at least keep pace with foreign rivals in perfecting the art of making goods Very vital is the difference between the condition of a country which is full of secure monopolies charging high prices at home and low prices abroad, and resting on their oars in the matter of technical improvements, and that of one in which the corporations sell their goods reasonably and improve their methods rapidly. The difference between the former state, which is intolerable, and the latter, which is nothing less than inspiring, may be caused by changing exorbitant duties to reasonable and scientific ones — duties which will protect an industry as such, but not a monopoly within the industry.

That many a duty now in force is composed of two perfectly distinct parts, of which one does the former of these things and the other does the latter, is the striking fact of the present time, and it sets at naught all question of dealing with the tariff in its entirety as either evil or good. One part can justify itself, while the other stands condemned in every eye except that of the man who thrives from illegitimate gains. For free trade we are not ready; but the policy that would "stand pat"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

convicts itself of demanding the retention of the pernicious half of the protective system with its results — the taxing of Americans, the favoring of monopolies, and the retarding of technical progress.

If the growth of trusts were the only important change which has recently called for a modification of our protective policy, the thing to be done might be to throw off at once the injurious portion of the duties and keep the beneficial one. We spoke, however, of two recent changes that must be taken into account, and of these the second is the new attitude of foreign nations. We are discovering that they as well as American purchasers can be made weary by the insane length to which we have carried the protective policy. The tax that we put on their products is something that they can reciprocate if they will, and they are now inclined to do it.

Such retaliation is one kind of reciprocity — the returning of injuries — and very much of this now looms up as a possibility. We are beginning to discover a new meaning in our favorite statement concerning a protective duty, "The foreigner pays the tax." If this is true, we pay it when it is Europeans who impose the duty and we are the "foreigners" in the case. When our own duties are in question, the action of the principle is pleasant enough, but it is far otherwise when theirs are in question. We are beginning to take account of the prospect of paying taxes in this way to foreign nations.

As the growth of monopolies calls for a scientific trimming and pruning of our own rank protective system, the impending action of other nations points to a plan which will make this reduction still further beneficial to us. It may induce concessions on their part, and that means the other kind of reciprocity — the mutual conferring of benefits. The benefits we may hope for will be widely diffused, for whenever a foreigner lowers the duty on our foodstuffs, it is farmers who get a full share of the benefit. Those who suffer more than most classes from monopoly will gain more than most from reciprocity.

We are no longer where we can think merely of our own protective duties and what they do for us. We must take into account the duties imposed, or likely to be imposed, by other countries in retaliation for ours. If the option that is offered to us is reciprocity in injury or reciprocity in benefit, it would seem that the latter would have a clear preference, even though the concessions we might make would cost us something. It happens, however, that a large amount of benefit can be counted on from a policy that will cost the country as a whole less than nothing, though it may reduce the gains of certain monopolies.

The whole system of protective duties requires re-examination, and this should go not merely to the length of considering what small modi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fications in our system of duties we can make without abandoning the principle on which the system rests. We need to know whether this very principle itself does not require a scientific division of duties into the two parts we have described, and the abolition of the evil part. We shall, in fact, actually find that the very motive which originally impelled us to impose duties, now requires that we should reduce them.

The fact which is emerging into view has to do with the relation between the traditional argument for free trade, on the one hand, and the prevalent argument for protection on the other. We now see that they are not inconsistent with each other. They do not meet and contradict each other and force us to abandon one of them. They are, as we may say, on different planes, and we may adhere to one without throwing away the other. In accepting the plea for the fostering of "infant industries," we find that this very policy requires us to make and apply the separation of duties into the part which protects an industry as a whole and that other part which protects a monopoly within it. The monopoly is hostile to the industry as such, and whatever fosters monopoly is not protective, but destructive. The principle on which we acted in imposing the duties, now requires us not to abolish them, but to make them smaller.

An intelligent discussion of protection begins by conceding what free-traders claim as to the wastefulness of it. This affords a starting point for an effective defence of the protective policy. Again, the complete acceptance of what the protectionist claims as to the fostering of new industries carries with it an unanswerable demand for the reduction of excessive duties. The argument for free trade is what may be called a *static* argument. It would be conclusive if the conditions of to-day were destined to continue forever without change. A protective duty which now causes us to make a particular article instead of exchanging another article for it inflicts a loss upon us. With no duty, we choose the method of procuring the article which gives us the largest amount of it as the fruit of a day's labor. We have the option of using N units of labor in making the commodity A, or using them in making the commodity B and exchanging it for A. If we get more of the A by the indirect process we naturally resort to it.

Forcing ourselves to do otherwise is accepting a loss; and if the conditions of to-day are the abiding ones — if no new features will enter into the situation — this loss will be permanent. That is saying that if the conditions of the various countries are static, and if the methods of producing different things are so — if no alterations occur in the processes of making them — the waste and loss which come from interfering with profitable exchanges will continue to the end of time, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will always be as large as at the outset. Offsetting gains will not accrue, and the protective policy will involve a permanent sterilizing of industry. This fact is as clearly established as any proposition in physics.

The protective argument, on the other hand, has rested on what we may call *dynamic* grounds. Important changes in the methods of production will take place, and some of them will be induced by the protective policy. We force ourselves to make something which at first we produce in an expensive way; and, with our eyes open, we forego some of the natural return for our labor. We make one blade of grass to grow where two grew before, in that we make one article in a day's labor where formerly we secured two such articles in exchange for the product of that day's labor. We consciously cause ourselves to suffer the loss which this misdirection of energy involves, and which the free-trader has from time immemorial pointed out.

In the end, however, it comes about that we can and do make the article with greater economy. We first master and then improve the technique of the industry which, in so costly a way, we introduce. We invent machinery, apply cheap motive power, place our mills in favorable localities and cause them to grow to enormous size. We organize and consolidate the industry, until, in the end, a day's labor signifies twice the product that it originally did. Now the wastefulness of the policy ceases. We get the two blades of grass which we got originally, instead of the one with which, for a time, we forced ourselves to be contented, and we live in the hope that we may ultimately get three.

This means that a day's labor spent in making the protected goods already gives us as many such goods as a day's labor spent in making something else to exchange for them. The growth of the industry in size and economy has put an end to the waste and loss which the policy originally entailed, and a further growth will probably yield a profit. In the end, as we believe, we shall be able to make more of the goods by the expenditure of a unit of labor than we could get by spending it in making other goods to barter for them.

The intelligent protectionist accepts the static argument in favor of free trade. He admits the wastefulness of protection and concedes that if the conditions of production never changed, the waste would never disappear. He points, however, to the fact that the conditions will change. Instead of taking a stationary state as a premise he takes a progressive one, and this invalidates the former conclusion. The state to which industries in America have now attained justifies this claim; but if we cast a backward glance over the entire history of manufacturing on this continent, we find that a part of the claim of the free-trader has also been justified. The iron industry, the perennial infant of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

protective system, has cost an immense deal in the introducing and developing. Yet who would now be willing to be without it? The waste and loss have been suffered up to a point at which the industry has attained a certain growth and perfection. This waste has become less with time, and, in the case of some branches of industry, it has given place to an undoubted gain.

From Alexander Hamilton's first protective duties, few and insignificant as they would seem to a protectionist of the present day, down to the Dingley tariff, with its drastic curtailment of natural exchanges, burdens and losses have attended the system; and yet the policy has already brought us to a point where many of the wastes have shrunk to *nil* and others are shrinking. More mills and larger and better ones than we should otherwise have had have come into existence under the costly forcing process. Mechanical genius has devised new machinery, and has put the whole process of manufacturing goods on such a plane of economy that a protectionist may plausibly argue that the labor of the country is already more productive than it would have been if trade had always been free.

Much capital and labor which would have been forced to employ themselves in mining and agriculture have betaken themselves to the mills. Mining and agriculture are subject to a law of diminishing returns. Overwork the land and you get less and less out of it; and we should have worked the land much harder than we have done if it had not been for the manufacturing. The mills, on the other hand, have become more productive with time, and the comparisons between the results gained in the mill with those that might have been gained on the farm have grown steadily more favorable to the mill.

No one can now intelligently claim that protection has from the start enriched the country; but, on the other hand, no one can intelligently deny that its after-effects may enrich the country. There has already come an increase of productive power. An increase has come in the recent years during which machinery and organization have given to manufacturing an efficiency not before attained. It is all due to the changes that have come about in production—to "dynamic" causes. It is of vital consequence that these changes should continue. It is not reasonable to expect that they will fully continue under duties which foster monopoly.

With no reference to any one particular duty, we have defined the general change that most needs to be made in our protective system. It is, for the country, a cheap reform, since it costs less than *nil;* but there is some loss connected with it for those who are now taxing the country unduly. These monopolists, however, can make no plea for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sparing of gains so secured, and the measure lets them keep all lawful ones. It would be the easiest bit of essential reforming that a people could be asked to carry through — if only it would prove to be as feasible politically as it is economically. What particular powers are apt to defeat measures which have corporate interests arrayed against them, this article does not undertake to say, and there is little need of saying. There is a clear policy before the country — a scientific treatment of protective duties, which means justice for all, and a gain for all, limited only by a rule of justice. The thing first to be done is to put the facts before the public and ask for a verdict on them.

The reduction of duties which sustain monopolies is not, indeed, the only change that the interests of the people call for. There is another type of protective duty which has no valid claim to continuance. It differs from the excessive duty on manufactures in two respects. First, it does not, as a rule, foster monopolies, but is designed to benefit a class which is as hostile to monopoly as any that the country contains, namely, the farmers. Moreover, most of the duties of this kind do not accomplish very much for good or for ill. Putting a duty on a product which, without a trace of protection, we should create and export, has, as a rule, only minor effects of any kind. It is not needed for the sake of diverting labor and capital to the occupation thus fostered, for they go there in any case. Moreover, the infant-industry argument usually counts in an adverse way in the case of products of agriculture. We nurse a branch of manufacturing through its years of helplessness for the reason that it will afterward become independent; but in a branch of agriculture the early years are usually those of greatest productivity.

Producing foodstuffs and such raw materials as cotton, wool, hides, hemp, lumber, etc., grows costlier as time goes by. These are industries of diminishing returns, and the lessening of their productivity is brought about by two causes. First, many of these products are created by a process that has been called "land butchery." For a term of years it is allowed to sap the fertility of the soil, and when the lean years come and the elements of fertility have to be artificially supplied, the production becomes a costly operation. These effects are very well illustrated by such lands as have been exploited for cotton, tobacco, hemp, or wheat.

Denuding the land of forests is, of course, a reckless exploitation; but scarcely less so is the tillage of hillsides on a plan that lets the loam make its way to the valleys. On all sides the earth is yielding not its produce, but itself, to the daring hands that are taking out its phosphorus, nitrogen, and what-not — cutting pounds of flesh near the heart by selecting and abstracting the most vital elements.

Again, the mere crowding of the land, even though its fertility were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not impaired, would reduce the returns of labor spent on it. One man on ten acres can get a much larger product than he can on five, and the growth of population, which steadily enlarges the number of men on the square unit of tillable land, reduces in this way men's products. If manufacturing begins as an infant and grows to full strength, agriculture begins in strength and goes on to something resembling decadence, or at least to a state in which the returns from it become smaller for each unit of labor expended.

It follows that the argument by which protection usually justifies itself has no application to duties on agricultural produce. If any branch of tillage begins its career as a weakling, it will be weaker still thereafter. Moreover, the free-trader's objection to duties which call labor from more productive occupations to less productive ones has here the fullest force. The waste which protection entails, whenever it does thus divert labor to unproductive fields, bids fair in some branches of agriculture to be permanent. To the end of time we can get more sugar for a day's labor by making goods and exporting them to regions where cane-growing flourishes than we can by raising sugar beets, and the loss which the protection of raw sugar entails on the country will grow larger rather than smaller with advancing years. The effect of a duty on lumber in hastening the destruction of American forests and sparing the Canadian will become clearer and more deplorable as this destruction becomes more and more complete.

In the case of most produce of the soil such evil effects are not experienced, for the reason that duties on them are nearly inoperative. They are worth little to the farmer, and do little harm to other classes. How much would the farmer gain and the country lose by a duty on cotton? The price would remain essentially the same, whether duties were put on or removed. On a few things duties have been imposed which have somewhat benefited farmers and considerably harmed the remainder of the people; and the injury from such duties will continue indefinitely. On more kinds of produce duties have been placed which have little effect for good or for ill.

There is a chance for a large transaction in the line of what we may term internal reciprocity — an exchange of benefits by two classes of our own people. A "deal" of an unhappy kind has won the farmer's assent to exorbitant protection. He lets manufacturers have the duties they ask for, on condition that his own produce be also protected. Duties such as now prevail on products of the mill mean somewhat monopolistic prices for goods, and they thus really and seriously burden the farmer; while duties on his own product amount to little in the way of increasing his revenues. That this should seem to the farmer a fair exchange

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of favors is strange. It is a bargain whereby the farmer gives a dollar and gets a dime, and either considers the bargain even or accepts it as such for lack of power to do better.

Now, there is a chance for another kind of reciprocity between farmers and manufacturers. Let the farmer give up the duties on his own products, which do him little good, and make the monopolistic manufacturers yield the unnecessary portion of the duties on their products, which does the farmer very considerable harm. The balance of effects will be in favor of the farmer. He will gain by the curbing of monopoly far more than he will lose by the free admission of foreign produce. Throwing off a duty on wheat will not greatly affect him; but curbing the monopolies which control the prices of implements, fuel, etc., will greatly benefit him.

There are, then, two concessions which we can readily make to foreigners whose markets we seek to win. Each of them means a removal of duties which ought to be removed in any case. Simply to abolish them would be one gain, and to induce the foreigner to unbar some of his doors would be another gain. They are, first, the unnecessary parts of duties on articles produced by monopolies; and secondly, nearly all duties on farming products. To the country in its entirety, parting with both of these is a good riddance.

Whatever we can thereby win from foreign countries will do us a further good; and an important fact is that such gains will accrue very largely to these same farmers. They will thereby win markets abroad for their own special products, and this will be an addition to the gain that will come to them from the curbing of monopolies. On this ground the farmers could afford to sacrifice all the duties on their own produce if in return the manufacturers would sacrifice the excess of the duties on theirs. Through the opening up of foreign markets both the farmers and the manufacturers are the gainers. Whether such reciprocal benefits between different classes at home will reconcile either to the surrender of duties may be somewhat doubtful; but it should more than reconcile the country to the abolition of them.

Will such a thing be done because the interests of the country require it? Yes, if the people perceive this fact and act on it; but not otherwise. Even the reduction of the exorbitant duties on manufactured goods will be impossible so long as a little minority shall have its way. This element will surely "stand pat," and the country itself may be forced to do so until the effects of so doing become still greater and clearer.

An opposition of interest between the few and the many is often decided in favor of the few. Now and again it may be said by the people

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a whole, as was once facetiously said by President Lincoln concerning his own administration, "We have little influence." If this is the case, all effort to secure reciprocity will fail, as it will, of course, if the people do not perceive the effects of the duties which need removal. There may be at some time a need of purchasing a freer outlet for our exports by concessions that will actually cost us something; but those which are here advocated are of the kind that cost less than nothing. It remains to be seen whether we shall be unwise enough or impotent enough to lose the double benefit which such concessions would secure.

JOHN BATES CLARK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE REHABILITATION OF CHINA AND THE AMERICAN INTEREST IN THE ORIENT.

Of the nations of antiquity, renowned for civilization and humanity, for literature and philosophy, for arts and industries, and for trade and husbandry, the Chinese alone, having survived the vicissitudes of time, stand forth to-day intact and compact. "Go back," says a writer, "into the darkness of time, long ere the birth of the Christian era, and you find the Chinese a great nation; go back still further, to the very confine of history, to a time prior to the birth of the mighty and now dead empires of Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon, to say nothing of Greece and Rome, and still you find the Chinese an established people." The Great Wall of China, a marvellous monument of human skill and industry — which through all the time since its erection has been accounted one of the seven wonders of the world, which has stood for two thousand years, and which stands to this day for the world to see — bears eloquent testimony to the antiquity of the race and to its advanced state of civilization in ages long gone by.

The Chinese have not always been the same exclusive "foreign-devil" hating people that they have been of late years. Under the Ming dynasty, which ruled over China before the present one, foreigners were made welcome rather than otherwise. Franciscan monks were received with marked favor by the great Kublai Khan at Peking in the middle of the thirteenth century, about the same time that the famous Marco Polo was making his journey through the country. Since 1644 A.D., however, when the present Manchu Ta-Tsing dynasty became established, the policy of seclusion commenced to obtain in China. The Manchus, being numerically insignificant in the midst of the teeming millions of China, deemed it advisable to keep their subjects from outside influences and thus to ensure the safety of their throne. On the other hand, the early European visitors to China were by no means the best specimens of their race, and often caused trouble to the Chinese government.

The first European people who appear to have established themselves in direct trading relations with China were the Portuguese, who have possessed a factory at Macao, at the month of the Canton River, ever since 1557. Other nations followed suit. The British East India

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Company came upon the scene in 1625 and opened a branch agency at Amoy. Trade with China in those days was an exceedingly profitable thing. The Europeans, curious to say, submitted to all Chinese formalities, though humiliating in the extreme, for the sake of trade, and continued to do so for nearly two hundred years. When the British hold on India became strong, they introduced Indian opium into China and reaped enormous profits from it.

Before long the Chinese statesmen realized the fact that the traffic in that soul-destroying drug was undermining the morals of the people and draining the precious metals out of the country; for all the money the English merchants paid to the Chinese for silk and tea was a trifle in comparison with what they received for opium. So the Chinese government prohibited the sale of opium in the Celestial empire and confiscated all chests of that deadly drug belonging to British merchants. This was the cause of the war England waged upon China in 1840, in which the Chinese were ultimately defeated and obliged to cede Hong-Kong to the English, while opening five ports, Canton, Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo, and Shanghai, for the residence of British merchants and their families.

From this time dates the commencement of European aggrandizement in the Flowery Kingdom and of the humiliation of the Celestials. The Chinese statesmen had hardly had time to reflect upon the altered conditions and prepare themselves to meet the new situation when there broke out within the Empire, in 1850, the terrible civil war known as the Taiping Rebellion. This domestic struggle was a grave crisis in the history of China, as it lasted till 1864 and resulted in the destruction of six hundred towns and the loss of millions of lives. While the Taiping Rebellion was fiercely raging, England again availed herself of an opportunity to steal a march on China, and declared a war against her in 1856 which lasted until 1860. It was through this fresh humiliation that the government of the Son of Heaven was forced to create the Tsung-Li-Yamen, corresponding to a ministry of foreign affairs, by virtue of which European powers were placed upon an equal footing with the government of the Celestial empire.

In August, 1861, in the midst of the Taiping Rebellion the Emperor of China, Hsien Tung died. His death left the field open for the Empress Dowager, Tsu Hsi, to seize the reins of supreme authority in the Empire, which she promptly did and has ever since held them in so tight a grasp that her authority is absolute to this day. The Emperor's son, Tung Chin, was but a tiny child at the time of his father's death, so the Empress Dowager and his mother, who was also an Empress, appointed themselves regents and took the control of the government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in their hands. They held the regency till 1873, when Tung Chin came of age and married. Tung Chin, who was addicted to fast living, also died in 1875, leaving a widow expecting to become a mother, but otherwise with no children.

The two Empresses looked about for the youngest relation they could find, in order thus to obtain the longest possible period of power for themselves as regents. Their choice fell on a nephew of the Empress mother, Ah-Iu-Ta (whose sister had married one of the late Emperor's brothers), a child four years of age named Tsaitien (the present Emperor), who was forthwith appointed Emperor with the new name of Kwang Hsu (Glorious continuity). Shortly afterward both the Empress Ah-Iu-Ta and the other Empress Coadjutor of the Empress Dowager disappeared, one after the other, from the scene, leaving the whole to the Empress Dowager, Tsu Hsi.

While the imperial household was thus engaged in intrigues for the usurpation of power, the European powers, under the lead of England, were busy in undermining the sovereignty of the Chinese government and scheming for the final partition of the Middle Kingdom. As Great Britain had obtained the legalization of the opium traffic in the Chinese dominions at the cannon's mouth in 1860, the Emperor of China dispatched, in 1868, a letter to Queen Victoria, both as a queen and as a woman, to concert measures for the suppression of the hideous opium curse, offering anything that might be desired in the way of concessions to British trade, if only this one curse might be removed. In spite of repeated efforts on the part of his Celestial Majesty to get a reply to the imperial request from the Queen of England, no response at all was received by the ruler of China.

Again, in 1877 the famous Li Hung Chang, for the Chinese Government, agreed at Chefoo, among other things, to open several additional ports to British commerce, only asking in return the privilege of increasing the import duty upon opium from thirty-six cents to about fifty-five cents a pound. The British Government promptly sent consular officers to the new ports, and then repudiated that part of the convention which allowed China to increase the opium duty. France in her turn tore away Cochin-China first from the Celestial dominions, and then established herself in Tonquin, ever pushing her aggressive policy into the Middle Kingdom from the south.

The last decade of the last century has been productive of more events in China — events of far-reaching consequence, of internal and external troubles, of reactionary and revolutionary movements, and of national humiliation and territorial loss — than a century of the previous history of the empire. In 1889, Emperor Kwang Hsu assumed the reins of govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment formally, the Empress Dowager, his aunt, still continuing to be the real power behind the throne. His Celestial Majesty, being possessed of clear intellect, temperate nature, and a strong desire to do good to his subjects and his empire, resisted all the temptations placed in his way and closely watched the events that were taking place in rapid succession. The Chino-Japanese war of 1894–95, and the consequent discomfiture of China, caused a rude awakening in the imperial observer.

Although the war was undertaken by Japan simply to bar the on-rushing wave of European aggression from Far Eastern regions, as a matter of fact, through the cruel irony of fate, it afforded greater facility to the European powers in the scramble for Chinese territory. It will be remembered that victorious Japan demanded, as one of the conditions of peace, the cession by China of the Liao-Tung peninsula to Japan, with the object of blocking the way of the Russian advance on Corea and to the Yalu Sea. But Russia, with the coöperation of France and Germany, frustrated Japan's plan and persuaded her to accept £5,000,000 in addition to the £30,000,000 of war indemnity.

Then followed the season of persuasion and coercion of China by the European powers. In 1895 Lord Salisbury coerced China to cede to Britain the Shan territory of Kokung on the upper Salween River and to give a perpetual lease of certain territory west of the Schweelee River, a tributary of the Irrawady. In addition, several important commercial concessions were demanded by England and obtained. Later on, Germany acquired Kiao-Chau; Russia, Port Arthur and Talienwan; France, Kwangchau; and Britain, Wei-hai-wei. Nay, the great powers of Europe, having come to a point of agreement, even went so far as to decide upon the partition of the Chinese Empire, and the spheres of influence to each power to be appropriated at an opportune moment. These stirring events, as they occurred, made a deep impression upon the observant mind of the Emperor Kwang Hsu, as well as upon thinking men among his subjects.

The Emperor thereupon sent for Kang Yu Wei, a most wonderfully enlightened Chinaman, and asked his advice on many points. The reformer recommended reforms of a sweeping nature, and the Emperor began to move too fast for his conservative people in effecting these reforms. Classical essays as a necessary part of examinations were abolished June 23, 1898; Western arms and drill were talked of for the Tartar troops; agricultural schools were to be established; patent and copyright laws were to be introduced; special rewards were offered to inventors and authors; trade was to be assisted; and even journalists were to be encouraged to air their views on politics. On September 7, 1898, the great Li Hung Chang and Ching Hsin were dismissed from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Tsung-Li-Yamen; the governorships of three provinces were abolished as a useless expense; and a week afterward the two presidents and four vice-presidents of the Board of Rites were also dismissed.

This wholesale weeding out of old officials created consternation in the ranks of the reactionaries. They made common cause with the Empress Dowager and succeeded in deposing the Emperor, Kwang Hsu. The Empress Dowager again took the reins of government into her own hands, and went to the other extreme in abolishing all the reforms the Emperor had introduced.

The retrograde policy of the Empress Dowager after the deposition of the Emperor in September, 1898, in the first instance, and the scramble after Chinese territory by the European powers on the other hand, aroused patriotic indignation among the educated Chinese. The political agitators got busy in propagating revolutionary doctrines among the populace. In the matter of the organization and formation of secret societies, the Chinese have the experience of thirty centuries, which makes them past-masters at the business. Moreover, China is a most fertile land for crops of newspapers. The two societies, the I-ho-Ch'uan (commonly called the "Boxers," but which, literally translated, means "Fist of Righteous Harmony") and the Ta-Tao-Hui, or "Big Sword Society," at last precipitated the rising of 1900, which was in reality as much anti-dynastic as anti-foreign.

When the danger of the overthrow of the Manchu Dynasty became imminent, the Empress Dowager, realizing the gravity of the situation, at once showed sympathy with the rebels and turned their attention to the foreigners. The humiliation suffered by the fugitive Imperial Court during the Boxer rising, and the excesses committed by European troops upon the helpless Chinese, coupled with the consequent diplomatic pressure for political and commercial concessions, produced a revolution in the views of the Empress Dowager. A strong pillar of the old régime, and the main-stay of reaction as she had been in former years, the Empress, convinced by the logic of events, and impelled by the instinct of self-preservation, became at last an ardent champion of modernizing China, and the zealous partisan of reforms.

With 1901 commenced the inauguration of a new era in the history of modern China. A great many important plans for the improvement of the fiscal and military organization of the Empire have since then been elaborated and put into practice. It has been decided that the land tax should be applied to the establishment of a regular civil service, the construction of a powerful navy, and the forming of an army of 500,000 men to begin with. The total estimated amount of land tax in China is 400,000,000 taels, or $248,000,000, from which 276,000,000 taels

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be taken for the above plan. Fifty million taels have been set aside for the repurchase of the railways, and concessions for their construction, now in the hands of foreigners, and for the subsidizing of lines of merchant steamers. The remaining 74,000,000 tales are to be applied to sanitation, hospitals, famine relief, canalization of rivers, the reorganization of justice and its administration, and for war.

It has become a regular custom of late to send yearly a batch of Chinese cadets to Japan to learn military art according to the modern science of warfare. In addition to this, several hundred young Chinamen belonging to good families are being sent to study other arts, as well as those of war, till the Japanese government has found itself obliged to impose certain restrictions in order to prevent its own youth being crowded out of the schools. Moreover, Japanese officials are already engaged in training and drilling Chinese troops in China itself. The military manœuvres between Peking and Tientsin performed by the newly organized Chinese troops last fall were in many ways exceedingly interesting and suggestive to the military attachés of the European powers who witnessed them.

In this work of regenerating the Celestials, their cousins, the Japanese, have rendered and are rendering valuable assistance by migrating into and settling in every important part of the Empire. Those Japanese immigrants, when settled in China, devote themselves to their various callings in life, as priests, teachers, editors, and so on. They have started newspapers in the Chinese language. Even the Japanese Buddhist monks have begun to arrive in China with the object of uniting the various Buddhist sects in that country. The Buddhist monasteries in Kalon have already placed themselves under the protection of the Japanese flag, and have become branches of the great Pen Yuan Thue monastery of Tokio. At Swatow (province of Iwangtung) Japanese monks have rented a temple, over which the Japanese flag has been hoisted, and they already have a large following.

The recent Japanese victories on the battlefields of Manchuria have really altered the political situation over the entire continent of Asia. The flash of a million rifles and the booming of two thousand big guns were to Asia the trumpet of resurrection and raised four hundred million dead Chinese from their graves of lethargy. Now there is life and motion in the Far East, and the yellow man has girded his loins to try conclusions with the rest of mankind in the fields of science, industry, and commerce. Woe unto those who would try to put any obstacles in his way! The Son of Heaven and the deified Mikado are brothers now, and have sworn to maintain the birthright of every member of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mongolian race to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness on this planet of ours.

The first indication of this resolution on the part of the Celestials was given to the world at large in the form of the boycotting of American goods in China as a retaliatory measure against the ill-treatment of Chinese in the United States of America. Moreover, the recent growth of anti-foreign feeling both among the Chinese officials and the people is not a matter of sentiment alone, but is the logical result of the intolerable situation created by the foreign diplomat and merchant in China in recent years, which is now incompatible with the dignity and interests of China in her awakened condition. The foreign negotiator of a treaty generally presented himself in a more or less beseeching attitude, and China assented generously, as she thought, to his prayers for treaty relations. But, ratifications once exchanged, what China had granted as treaty privileges forthwith became, in the hands of the other party, treaty rights.

It has thus come to pass that Chinese officials have felt themselves belittled and inconvenienced by treaties. Again, the advent of the foreign trader, on the other hand, has been a death blow to old and long-recognized native interests and, notably, to China's own shipping trade and junk owners. The coasting trade, which fleets of junks carried on fifty years ago, has been all but destroyed between New-Chwang and the southern ports, and much of the southern trade has likewise passed from native to foreign bottoms; while on the Yangtze, an inland water, an ever increasing home trade has been during the last few years more and more attracting foreign-flag steamers.

Consequently, the native capitalist of former days is a beggar now, and the crowds of junkmen he employed are as angry with their government for permitting the foreigner to step in and seize such local trade as with the foreigner himself for doing so. Does any other country in the world allow foreign flags to participate in its coasting trade and throw open its inland waters to outsiders, and that, too, to outsiders who are not merely enjoying special commercial advantage, but who are also by treaty, extra-territorialized?

The question of the extra-territoriality of foreigners, which has ever been and is to-day the real source of chagrin to the Chinese politically, commercially, and socially, has been lately occupying the minds of both Chinese government and people, and they seem to have made up their minds to abolish it, as they have decided to give no more concessions to foreigners.

The Shanghai riot of December last forcibly illustrates the case in point. The widow of a Cantonese official who had died in western

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

China was on her way home down the Yangtze River with several little slave girls procured there, as is customary in China. A waiter on the steamboat, thinking his gratuity inadequate, revenged himself on her by telegraphing to Shanghai that the lady had with her kidnapped girls. She was arrested upon arriving at Shanghai by the Municipal police and taken to the mixed court before a British Assessor. No evidence being at hand, the lady was ordered detained, the Municipal police being instructed to take her to the Settlement, and the mixed court runners ordered by the Chinese Magistrate to keep her where she was outside the foreign jurisdiction. This conflict led to a fight, in which the Sikh police struck the Chinese Magistrate over the head, greatly exasperating the sober Chinese, who, not unnaturally, considered the case as having no real relation to foreigners at all, and as in origin nothing less than blackmail. Each party formulated an ultimatum, and the execution of international justice came to a sudden end, pending the decision of the foreign Ministers in Peking. When it appeared certain that this was unjust and partisan, an organized riot broke out, differing in essential particulars from anything yet seen in China, in which about twenty Chinese were killed.

These inconveniences, and this indignity and exasperation, caused by foreigners, China has determined to put an end to. China, says a writer, is at last wide awake, and, like other too sound sleepers, when aroused, is not happy either in mind, body, or estate. The visit of the Imperial Chinese Commissioners to this country and Europe must convince even the most skeptical as to the reality of China's determination to turn over a new leaf.

The boycotting of American goods in China which has already tied up the Far-Eastern trade of this country is really caused by the American boycott of the Chinese, by discrimination against them, and keeping them out of this republic. It is time that this land of the free, where the rights of man have been recognized as the basis of its constitution, should remove the stigma it bears among the nations of indulging in racial prejudices, and be ever in the van of progress and civilization. The time has arrived when the American people should take into serious consideration the chances of gaining the huge markets of the East, as the United States of Europe have already inaugurated an era of resistance to the commercial aggrandizement of the United States of America, under the hegemony of Germany, through the new arrangement of interstate treaties.

The development of Manchuria by the Japanese will attract, to be sure, the Chinese coolies there and keep them employed in their own country for a long time to come. This country could supply material for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

railroad construction, machinery, and implements for husbandry and other lines for years to come to develop the resources of Manchuria. In the case of China proper, these supplies will be needed many times over when the work of the eighteen provinces of the Middle Kingdom is undertaken in earnest by the Chinese themselves.

The construction of the Panama Canal, upon which millions are to be expended, will lose its object if the Eastern markets are not to be secured beforehand through the good will of the Orientals. The sending of American troops from the Philippines, on the other hand, to coerce China, as it was rumored had been suggested, might merely result in doing a good turn to the commercial rivals of this country. Moreover, the forcing of foreign trade upon the unwilling Chinese will not succeed; for, let it be clearly understood on the authority of those who know the country well, that China needs neither imports nor exports, and can do without foreign intercourse. A fertile soil, producing every kind of food, a climate which favors every variety of fruit, and a population which for tens of centuries has put agriculture, the productive native industry which feeds and clothes, above all other occupations, — China has all these and more, and foreign traders can only hope to dispose of their merchandise there in proportion to the new tastes they introduce; the new wants they create, and the care they take to supply the demand which really exists.

The Chinese have the best food in the world, rice; the best drink, tea; and the best clothing, cotton, silk, and fur; and, possessing these staples and their innumerable native adjuncts, they do not need to buy a cent's worth elsewhere, while their Empire is in itself so great and they themselves so numerous, that sales to each other make an enormous and sufficient trade, and export to foreign countries is unnecessary. Let those who still preach the gospel of force hear what John Chinaman says, and which, in the opinion of this writer, is soon to be realized:

"Yes, it is we who do not accept it that practise the Gospel of Peace; it is you who accept it that trample it under foot, and — irony of ironies! — it is the nations of Christendom who have come to us to teach us by sword and fire that the Right in this world is powerless unless it is supported by Might. Oh, do not doubt that we shall learn the lesson. And woe to Europe when we have acquired it. You are arming a nation of four hundred millions — a nation which, until you came, had no better wish than to live at peace with itself and all the world. In the name of Christ you have sounded the call to arms: in the name of Confucius we respond."

MOHAMMAD BARAKATULLAH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"IN INTEREST AND VALUE UNSURPASSED."

The Memoirs of Prince Hohenlohe

"Not ordinary memoirs, but impressions felt by a keenly sensitive, highly trained and experienced observer . . . transcribed with disconcerting frankness."—New York Post.

THE AUTHOR'S WIDE RANGE OF OBSERVATION COVERED:

In his youth:	The Revolution of '48.
As Bavarian Minister:	The first beginnings from which, under the leadership of Prussia, the German Empire rose.
As Ambassaaor to France 1874-1885	The critical years of the upbuilding of France, after the Franco-Prussian war, while Bismarck chafed for an excuse to strike a final blow.
As Statthalter at Strassburg 1885-1894	The riveting of the conquered provinces into the fabric of the Empire. The tragedy of the Emperor Frederick's reign; the young Emperor William's struggle for the reins of his Empire, and Bismarck's dismissal in 1890.
As Imperial Chancellor 1894-1901	The six years in which he filled Bismarck's old position, while remaining Bismarck's friend. His varied experience, his official relations, and the ties of blood relationship, brought him into close touch with the Courts of almost every Power of Western Europe.

"He writes as an observer, temperate, judicious and cool, convincing, not because he seeks to convince, but because he writes with conviction."—Spectator, London.

The Memoirs of Prince Hohenlohe

Two volumes 8vo Illustrated. $6 net.

PUBLISHED BY **THE MACMILLAN COMPANY** 64-66 5TH AVE., N. Y

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN MEN OF SCIENCE

A BIOGRAPHICAL DIRECTORY

EDITED BY J. McKEEN CATTELL,

Professor of Psychology in Columbia University; Editor of *Science* and of *The Popular Science Monthly*

There are included in the directory the records of more than four thousand men of science, and it is believed that the entries are tolerably complete for those in North America who have carried on research work in the natural and exact sciences. It was intended that each entry should contain information, as follows:

(1) *The full name with title and mail address, the part of the name ordinarily omitted in correspondence being in parenthesis.* (2) *The department of investigation given in italics.* (3) *The place and date of birth.* (4) *Education and degrees.* (5) *Positions with dates; the present position being given in italics.* (6) *Temporary and minor positions.* (7) *Honorary degrees and other scientific honors.* (8) *Membership in scientific and learned societies.* (9) *Chief subjects of research, those accomplished being separated by a dash from those in progress.*

The work has been edited with great care and is believed to be as complete and accurate as any book of the character. It is well printed on all rag paper made expressly for the book and is bound in buckram with leather label.

Price: $5.00, *net*, postage paid.

The SCIENCE PRESS, Sub-Station 84, New York City

3

The Piano of the Period is the KNABE

More than the allotted "span of life" has been spent in bringing the Knabe to its present high state of piano perfection. Descriptive catalogue of the "World's Best Piano" sent upon request.

WM. KNABE & CO.

New York **Baltimore** **Washington**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED